DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 097 SP 017 330

AUTHOR	Kaplan, Philip
TITLE	The Cost and Efficient Utilisation of Resources. Synthesis Report. In-Service Education and Training of Teachers: Towards New Policies.
INSTITUTION	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris (France). Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	92p.; For related documents, see SP 017 325-326, and SP 017 328. Several pages may not reproduce clearly.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Cooperation: *Cost Effectiveness: Educational Finance: Educational Planning: Educational Resources: Efficiency: Foreign Countries: Government Role: *Inservice Teacher Education: *Organizational Effectiveness: Postsecondary Education: *Program Costs: Program Development: *Resource Allocation: *Use Studies

ABSTRACT

Case studies were made of the cost and efficient utilization of resources for inservice education and training of teachers (INSET) in England, Australia, the United States, Denmark, Sweden, and France. The studies were prepared on the basis of four main topics: (1) analysis of costs: (2) efficient or full utilization of resources: (3) financing: and (4) organization and planning. This report covers these four topics and examines the links between them. National, local, and programmatic costs are examined as well as how the cost burden is distributed among participants. The problems of conflict and collaboration in INSET planning are explored. Factual data on costs, finance, and planning for each of the six countries studied in this project are summarized in the appendix. (JD)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED198097

centre
for
educational
research
and
innovation

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF TEACHERS :

TOWARDS NEW POLICIES

The Cost and Efficient Utilisation of Resources

SYNTHESIS REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Laderriere
____
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 017 330

OECD ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

2

CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND INNOVATION
(CERI)

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF TEACHERS: TOWARDS NEW POLICIES

The Cost and Efficient Utilisation of Resources

Synthesis Report

by

Philip Kaplan
Consultant to the CERI

The views expressed are those of the author
and do not commit either the Organisation
or the National Authorities concerned

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT
1980

1586

CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

I.I Aim and Context of the Report 1
I.II National Contextual Factors in INSET Cost and Resource Utilisation 4

II. ANALYSIS OF COSTS

2.1 National INSET Costs 7
2.1.1 The Problems of Measuring National INSET Effort 11
2.2 Regional and Local INSET Costs 13
2.3 Programme Costs 15
2.3.1 Teacher Centres 17
2.3.2 Medium Length Courses 17
2.3.3 Longer INSET Courses 20
2.3.4 Conclusions 20

III. FINANCING

3.1 Patterns of INSET Finance 24
3.2 Financing Teacher Time in INSET: the Search for Guidelines 25
3.2.1 A Rule of Thumb: Systems Needs versus Individual Needs 26
3.2.2 Objections to This Rule and a Possible Middle Ground 27
3.2.3 Related Questions of Teacher Motivation 28
3.2.4 Teacher Release and Teacher Professionalism 30
3.3 Finance and Control; Finance and Participation 31
3.4 Conclusion: Difficult Choices and the Role of Central Government 32

IV. PLANNING FOR EFFECTIVE RESOURCE UTILISATION

4.1 Can we Measure the Cost Effectiveness of INSET Programmes? 34
4.1.1 Observations from Case Study Writers 34
4.1.2 Problems in Measuring INSET Cost Effectiveness 35
4.1.3 Some Tentative Solutions and Their Implications 36
4.2 Maximising Resource Utilisation: the Resource Table 37
4.2.1 Lessons of the Resource Utilisation Table .. 38
4.3 Trends in Resource Utilisation and their Implications 39
4.3.1 Problems in Mixing Resources 40
4.4 Problems of Conflict and Collaboration in INSET Organisation and Planning 41
4.4.1 Some General Remarks 42

Page

4.4.2 Relations between Central and Local Government Units 43
4.4.3 Relation of Universities and Teacher Training Colleges to INSET Activities ... 44
4.4.4 Relation of INSET and Research 45
4.4.5 The Problematic Status of Regional INSET Bodies 46
4.4.6 Teacher Participation in INSET Planning . 47
4.4.7 A Few Conclusions on Collaborative Planning 48

VI. CONCLUSIONS 49

APPENDIX I : Resource Utilisation Table 53

APPENDIX II: Country Overviews: Cost Tables, Finance, and Planning 55

2.1 England and Wales 56
2.2 Australia 65
2.3 United States 70
2.4 Denmark 75
2.5 Sweden 81
2.6 France (certain aspects) 84

Sources used and quoted 85

I. INTRODUCTION

I.I Aim and Context of the Report

The study of the cost and efficient utilization of resources for in-service education and training of teachers (INSET) is the result of several concurrent and sometimes conflicting trends in Member countries of OECD. On the one hand, certain trends encourage the expansion of INSET. The stability or decline in enrolments in compulsory schooling in most Member countries has led to great reductions in the number of new teachers brought into the teaching force. In many countries, a large proportion of teachers presently in the system will probably remain there for several decades. Hence a redirection of resources from initial teacher training to INSET. Teachers' desires to secure their professional status and, in some cases, their autonomy, as well as educational and political leaders' efforts to make sure that educational reforms are more effective in practice also lead to expansion of INSET.

On the other hand, educational institutions in the West are feeling the combined effects of worldwide economic slowdown of growth or recession and of an emerging new world economic order in which cheap and plentiful raw materials from third world countries cannot be counted on, especially as regards sources of energy. Many Western governments are taking a critical look at social welfare expenses to see where savings are possible. New investments planned in INSET can thus be called into question, and governments are tempted to take the savings generated by reduced enrolments and reduced initial teacher training, which proponents of INSET hoped would be redirected into INSET, and to use them to cut educational expenses in general.

Those interested in INSET are thus encouraged to take a closer look at questions of efficiency and effectiveness in INSET, including questions of how much INSET programmes cost, what resources can be mobilised to meet these costs, who should finance INSET programmes, whether and how cost-effectiveness can be judged, and what INSET organisation is likely to produce the best economic and educational results.

In attempting to address these questions, this report, as a part of the overall OECD project reviewing INSET, is directed mainly at two different audiences: educational and governmental decision-makers on the national, state, regional, and local level, on the one hand, and INSET specialists involved in ongoing programmes, on the other hand. The expectations of these two audiences are at times contradictory. The former want clear cost data and guidance on planning issues, while the latter are wary of too easy generalisation from approximate figures and believe that the context and purpose of each programme tend to make general guidelines difficult. To satisfy both, more clarity is needed on what INSET is and what its objectives are; also needed are specific cases of how problems in these areas have been resolved and ideas on how they might be resolved in the future.

Unfortunately, collection and analysis of data on cost and efficient utilization of INSET resources present a number of problems. Data on teachers available in most OECD countries are usually less detailed than data on students. Data on costs are also usually harder to obtain than enrolment-type data. Data on the cost of in-service teacher training are thus even more difficult to obtain. This kind of INSET data also presents problems because so much INSET activity is spread out among different types of institutions, both local and national. In addition, the variety of forms and contexts of INSET activity makes rigorous comparison difficult. This variety is laudable on pedagogical grounds and given the state of the art, but it makes it easy to fall into the trap of comparing things that are not comparable, even without crossing the border from one country to another.

During the first phase of the OECD project concerning INSET, ten national reports were produced. These reports focused on innovation in INSET and included local case studies. They also included some preliminary indications on INSET costs, resources, and organisation. Dr. Bolam presented a synthesis of these national reports in his general report(1). The general report also specifies six areas for further study, including this one, on INSET cost and resource utilization.

Case studies for this area were prepared on the basis of four main topics: (1) analysis of costs; (2) efficient or full utilization of resources; (3) financing; and (4) organisation and planning. In analysis of costs, case study writers were asked to look, when possible, at both total national costs and individual programme costs. Utilisation of resources was intended to be a comparison of how different resources were used for different kinds of programmes, while financing was an attempt to review who pays for what and what feelings this generates, as well as possible new sources of finance. Planning was meant to address problems of conflict and collaboration in planning, and planning as a key factor in cost and resource control.

The case studies speak to these four general areas in the manner and to the extent appropriate to varying national and local contexts. Case study writers, in addition, raised a number of more controversial points, in particular, whether it is possible to talk about effectiveness in relation to costs. Complete case studies were circulated among experts for this area concerning England and Wales, Denmark, Australia, and some relevant United States experience.

A case study was later submitted for Sweden and for certain French experiences. This general report also draws on a variety of other sources, including the previous national reports on innovation and concurrent studies in other areas of the OECD INSET project and oral input of case study writers and experts present at the two day conference held at OECD headquarters in Paris in April, 1979 to review a draft of this report.

---

(1) I.R. Bolam, *Innovation in in-Service Education and Training of Teachers*, Practice and Theory, OECD, Paris, 1978.

This report not only covers the four topics mentioned above, but also shows the links between them. It begins with a look at INSET costs, including national, local, and programmatic costs, and continues by looking at the question of how this cost burden is distributed among participants, as well as the conflicts that this distribution can cause. Critical questions in these two areas, such as how to reconcile centralised funding with decentralised control, lead to the topic of planning for effective resource utilisation. Under this topic, a review of the difficulties of relating costs directly to effectiveness leads to another approach, maximising resource utilisation by mixing resources from different sources in the same INSET programme. The problems involved in this approach are linked to the final topic, conflict and collaboration in INSET planning, since using several resources means having several INSET agents planning and working together.

Factual data on costs, finance, and planning for each of the six countries studied in this report are summarised in the country overviews in the Appendix. More detailed data on these topics are available in the individual case studies.

This report does not claim to present any definitive answers to the problems posed. The scarcity and diverse nature of the data do not allow that. Rather, it seeks to set up a framework for informed debate on these difficult and troublesome questions and to give a sense of the kind of evidence available. It is hoped that new and better solutions on the local, national, and international level will flow from such a debate.

I.II National Contextual Factors in INSET Cost and Resource Utilization

An introduction to the areas of INSET costs, financing, and planning for resource utilization would not be complete without some consideration of how they are affected by national contextual factors. These factors are especially important to bear in mind when one is making general comparisons between various aspects of INSET in different countries, or when one is tempted to suggest that practices in one of these areas might be transferred from one country to another.

A brief review of the relevant OECD literature, as well as statements by INSET specialists, underline the importance of the following contextual factors: (The list is given in outline form, since readers are undoubtedly familiar with most of these factors. It is not necessarily all-inclusive, nor does it represent order of importance.)

1. Factors specific to INSET as an activity

1.1 Questions of INSET philosophy and purpose (example: Is INSET a means for transmitting new research knowledge or for teacher personal development?) Multiple purposes common here, as in education generally.

1.2 Organisations and groups involved in INSET
See Bolam's classification into providers and users of INSET and their relationship in various INSET tasks, illustrated by matrix in text of Bolam's report(2).

2. Factors related to educational system in general

2.1 General structure of educational system, including pupil progress through system, organisation of higher education, especially preservice teacher training (latter institutions can have large influence on general INSET context).

2.2 Means by which education is financed (related to questions of general government finance and state-local relations; often include special resource equalisation mechanisms).

2.3 Composition and evolution of teaching body, including working conditions, aspirations, social life, unions.

2.4 Relation of school to local community life, including demographic and social traits of community.

3. Factors related to national environment outside education, including:

3.1 Economic: general resource availability and price of factors needed for INSET, including transportation, general national demographic trends, economic trends affecting government finance.

3.2 Political: degree of national political consensus, direction of social programmes, and state of relations between national, regional, and local government units.

A few concrete examples will show how questions of INSET cost and resources, as well as INSET in general, are influenced by these and related contextual factors. The INSET scene in the United States, for instance, is very varied: examples of very important innovation in INSET coexist side by side with localities in which there is little organised INSET activity. This is due in part to the fact that INSET has generally not been seen as a national priority by policy makers, but rather as an afterthought, an addendum to existing programmes (although recently attitudes have been changing in favour of INSET). It is also influenced by the highly decentralised structure of education in the United States, in which the different states, and, in many cases, the local educational agencies, have the largest share of decision-making power and finance. This situation, by the way, is considered a strength by many United States' participants in INSET. Federal programmes in this context tend to be an overlay designed to correct inequalities between individuals, groups, or localities in education, so that federal programmes which include an INSET component can be spread rather unevenly around the country, often based on criteria unrelated to INSET needs. (Federal teacher centre programmes are an exception to this general pattern.)

---

(2) ibid.

At the same time, teachers in the United States generally work under conditions which encourage them to plan their own in-service training as a function of personal, individual career development; especially important in this respect are salary credits given for INSET work completed. In addition, there has recently been a sharp increase in teachers' consciousness of their interests as a group, as evidenced by large-scale movements toward unionisation. This trend has had its impact on INSET with the movement for teacher control of INSET, especially through teachers' centres. Other factors, such as the accountability movement or recent trends in research, could easily be cited.

In France, a number of contextual factors help to explain the present INSET situation. First, there is no long-standing and continuous tradition of in-service training, and INSET does not appear to be a privileged vehicle for educational reform. This can be related to a traditional lack of emphasis on pedagogy or educational sciences in higher education. Secondly, the history of unions and collective bargaining has been more collaborative and less political on the primary than on the secondary level. This helps to explain the greater attention given to INSET on the primary than on the secondary level. However, the priority given to one subject in secondary education, mathematics, helps to explain the most important INSET initiative on the secondary level, the IREMs, or regional mathematics institutes. Other INSET activity on the secondary level is often voluntary, outside of official circles, and run by different associations which can have a particular ideological bent. Finally, the highly centralised structure of the educational system in general, helps explain, first of all, the general lack of "school-based" activities. Schools and teachers possess little autonomy to take concerted action within official structures and thus lack the means or motives for contracting for INSET aimed specially at their particular group needs. They also have few autonomous providers of INSET to turn to. In addition, since curriculum is decided centrally, there is little opportunity to combine INSET and curriculum development.

In Denmark, a number of contextual factors help to explain the relatively general coverage of teachers in compulsory, pre-gymnasium schooling by INSET (one third to one fourth participate yearly in courses longer than the study day variety) and the relative ease with which resources are secured for a continuing programme of in-service training and education. First, INSET is a relatively old and well-established activity in Denmark, and it continues to be recognised, both nationally and locally, as a high priority. Second, the Royal Danish School of Educational Studies (DLH) is a unique national INSET institute. On the one hand, it provides nationwide coverage and co-ordination of INSET activities other than study days. On the other hand, its decentralised governance structure, modeled on the university structure, allows for a large amount of teacher participation in the planning and choice of courses to be offered. (This structure is described in the country overview.) It is rare to see so much teacher influence on the national level in both policy and programme planning. The success of INSET may also be related to the large amount of autonomy that teachers enjoy in this area, as in certain others, as well as to the social situation of the primary school teacher. Heavy reliance on part-time release (up to six hours per week) spread out over a semester or a year for more intensive forms of INSET and planned well in advance may be an additional positive factor.

Other, less obvious structural aspects of the Danish educational system provide internal motivation to attend INSET. In the primary school (grades 1-10), the teacher who has the main responsibility for a class of students can follow that class for up to eight to ten years. (He is usually also responsible for teaching the national language.) During and especially at the end of such a cycle, no one needs to tell him that he needs further training to prepare for his new responsibilities.

Readers familiar with these and other national contexts could easily add their own examples of contextual factors affecting INSET and its cost and resource use patterns.

In conclusion, one is led to wonder, since countries differ so much in all the ways listed and illustrated above, how the material organisation of INSET can have anything at all in common among them. Two factors appear to act as a counterweight to the tendencies toward diversity represented by national contextual factors. First, there appear to be certain communalities in the act of classroom teaching itself. One OECD study has analysed a pilot transfer and field testing in several OECD countries of microteaching, a system of teacher training based on analysis of concrete aspects of teacher behaviour in the classroom. The study notes, in relation to the in-service teaching of "effective questioning" techniques, that:

> While the teachers across sites differed in their use of one or two specific skills, the overall similarity in pre- and post-course performance and the similarity in per cent of change in the desired direction among the sites is remarkable ... (3).

Although the study is limited in scope, it suggests that certain aspects of classroom behaviour may be common to most Western countries, and thus that INSET designed to deal with this situation may also possess certain common characteristics.

---

(3) OECD, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. The International Transfer of Microteaching Programmes for Teacher Education, Paris, 1975.

Second, on a more "macro" level, the differences between the countries included in this study can be exaggerated. They all belong to a recogniseable economic and social grouping of countries in the world and share certain communalities as a result of this. Nevertheless, it is important to keep in mind these contextual differences in attempting to think in a more general way about INSET costs, resources, financing, and organisation and planning, and in drawing any practical conclusions from the following chapters on these subjects.

II. ANALYSIS OF COSTS

The study of costs of INSET activities is perhaps the area in which results are farthest from expectations. One hopes for a multitude of hard facts and figures and for at least a few indisputable generalisations. Instead, one finds that relatively few things can be said objectively on this subject, for the reasons mentioned in the introduction: lack and dispersion of data and non-comparability of programmes. Added to this is the fact that INSET is often an ongoing activity of teachers and administrators carried on concurrently with other activities, so that its costs are often not clearly separated out.

This brief review of cost data gleaned from different OECD studies will attempt to discover key cost factors within the control of those who make decisions about INSET. Ideally, different forms of INSET should be presented as alternative ways of achieving overall goals of the educational system, such as teaching cognitive skills, notions of democracy and so on. The costs of these different forms of INSET would then be presented. In fact, the picture is not so clear, as a later chapter will show. Key cost factors will be considered here on two levels. First, on the national and local levels, an attempt will be made to discover where the principal costs lie and if INSET effort can be measured in relation to other educational costs or to other measures. Second, key cost factors in several different kinds of INSET programmes will be considered, and the problem of comparing costs between different kinds of programmes will be considered.

For each kind of cost, a Table from one country will be included as an example in this chapter. Other cost Tables will be found in the country overviews in Appendix II.

2.1 National INSET Costs

Only three of the five case studies attempted to construct tables summarising total INSET costs in their countries. (See Tables in Appendix.) This is understandable, given the decentralised nature of schooling in most of the countries involved. In these Tables and in figures given in the texts and Tables of the other case studies (the latter summarise only central government expenditures), salaries and direct services connected with course provision loom large.

For instance, in England and Wales, cost of trainers, materials, and services amounts to about half of the total national costs, albeit the Table has many "holes". In Australia, course costs and other costs associated with provision, excluding the salary costs of teacher replacement, though not given in detailed form, appear to be well over half of the total national costs. For the Royal Danish School of Educational Studies (the DLH), which handles medium- and long-term INSET for grades 1-10 teachers in all Denmark, salaries for lecturers represents the preponderant cost, although no exact figures for teacher release or replacement are included. (See Table 14 in Appendix II.) In contrast, the Swedish national estimation shows about 4/5 of national costs going to payment of substitute teachers. (See Table A on next page.)

These figures can be misleading, as many activities, especially local ones, can be left out. For instance, in Denmark, every school and its staff has a right to four study days a year (in grades 1-10). No exact figures are available for the opportunity cost of these study days, but it may well surpass the total budget for DLH(4). In Sweden, where local school boards can run five study days a year, the cost of these study days is close to two thirds of all national costs. (See Table B below.) One might suspect that, in other countries besides Sweden, more complete data would show a large proportion of national costs going to teacher salaries or replacement.

Entitlement to take paid leave for individual study can also represent a considerable expense if implemented nationally. In England, the White Paper recommended in substance:

(i) All teachers to be entitled to release for INSET for periods equivalent to one term in every seven years of service (eventually one term in five years).

(ii) A substantial expansion of in-service training to begin in the school year 1974-75 and thereafter to continue progressively so as to reach the target of 3 per cent release by 1981(5).

These proposals have apparently not been implemented, due to lack of funds and the economic crisis. In France, primary school teachers are entitled to the equivalent of one year of paid leave in their career(6). In Sweden, tenured teachers can apply for a paid sabbatical leave of a year once every ten years

---

(4) See H. Andersen and T.P. Olsen, "The Danish Example" in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Cost and Financing Implications - III The Danish and Swedish Examples. OECD/CERI, Paris, 1979, pp. 8 and 50-54 for relevant cost data.

(5) R. Bolam, Innovation in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers, United Kingdom, OECD, Paris, 1976.

(6) G. Belbenoit, Innovation in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers, France, OECD Paris, 1976.

TABLE A

National Cost of INSET 1978/79 in Sweden (distribution among types of cost)

Type of cost	NBE	CBE	ID	LSB	SGS	TU	Total	%
1. Expenditure on permanent staff	1.7	21.1	6.5	– 2)	–	– 3)	29.3	7
2. Cost of trainers and material	0.1	3.0	6.4	–	–	0.1	9.6	2
3. Travelling expenses	0.5	3.4	8.0	–	–	0.1	12.0	3
4. Boarding expenses	–	1.5	8.5	–	–	–	10.0	2
5. Payment of substitute teachers	–	1.1	3.9	–	355.7 4)	–	360.7	81
6. Local development projects 1)	1.5	0.8	0.3	1.5	–	–	4.1	1
7. INSET in Labour-Market Training	–	–	–	–	20.0	–	20.0	4
Total	3.8	30.9	33.6	1.5	375.7	0.2	445.7	100

Abbreviations:

NBE: National Board of Education

CBE: County Board of Education

ID: Regional INSET Departments

LSB: Local School Board

SGS: Paid through the State Grant System direct to the LSB

TU: Teachers' Unions

1) From the R & D budget of the NBE. Not possible to divide into different types of costs.

2) Total LSB costs not known. They can be approximated to about 15 million.

3) Total TU costs not known. Given figures represent funds from NBE to TU.

4)

Study days:	270
Sabbatical year:	70
School Management Training:	14.3
Working Life Experience Programmes:	1.4

Source: S.E. Henricson, "The Swedish Example" on In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and financing implications - III The Danish and Swedish Examples, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1980.

TABLE B

National Cost for Different INSET Activities in 1978/79 in Sweden

Type of Activity	Cost	%
1. Study days	274	62
2. Summer courses	8.1	2
3. Team Training	10.1	2
4. School Management Training	23.4	5
5. Working life experience	2.4	-
6. Sabbatical year system	70	16
7. Local development	4.1	1
8. Central and regional planning	31.2 1)	7
9. Travelling scholarships and grants to teachers' organisations	0.6	-
10. INSET for the Labour-Market Training	20	5
11. Other activities	1.8	-
Total	445.7	100

1) Including travelling expenses for permanent personnel and for evaluation.

Source: S.E. Henricson, op. cit. Table A.

to their local school boards; this leave may be taken in half year periods(7). Only in the case of Sweden is a real cost of this paid leave entitlement given; it is the second most costly INSET activity in Sweden, taking up about one sixth of national costs (see Table B on previous page). In Sweden as elsewhere, the voluntary nature of entitlement makes its cost in the future hard to predict. However, generally, it would appear to be a large item in national costs. Figures and estimates in the English case study appear to indicate that a full year's release for 3 per cent of the teaching population would cost about as much as, if not more than, total national expenditures on INSET(8).

2.1.1 The Problems of Measuring National INSET Effort

It would be helpful if it were possible to compare the total national INSET effort in various countries to total national expenses in education. A brief comparison of national cost tables here an in Appendix II shows the futility of this exercise; national INSET costs, when calculated, are calculated in very different ways. Some include only central government costs, others show costs to regional or local government as well. Some include estimated cost of teacher replacement, others do not. Some include INSET for teachers only, others for all educational personnel. Certain costs are particularly hard to estimate and may be considered "hidden" costs. Among these are time educational personnel spend on advising, use of existing building and facilities for INSET, teachers' voluntary contributions of their own time for INSET activities, and the problem of attributing the indirect costs of higher education courses (administration, facilities, research, etc.) to INSET. We will return to some of these problems in later sections. At this point, it can simply be noted that national INSET costs take up from 1 per cent to 5 per cent of total national education costs, depending on the country and the method of calculation used(9).

---

(7) S.E. Henricson, "The Swedish Example" in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications - III The Danish and Swedish Examples - OECD/CERI, Paris, 1980.

(8) H.W. Bradley, In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications - II The British Example - OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978, pages 39, 49 and 58.

(9) ibid., page 58; P. Cameron, "The Australian Example" in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications - I The Australian and United States' Examples - OECD/CERI, Paris 1978, page 16; J.C. Thurber, "The United States Example" in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications - I The Australian and United States' Examples, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1979, page 23.

A standardisation of national costing of INSET along the lines indicated by the English and the Swedish tables would be desirable. The grouping of costs according to specific programmes, as in the second Swedish table and to some extent in the Australian table, should be particularly helpful to decision-makers. A two dimensional table showing who pays for different kinds of costs would also be helpful. Finally, one might want to distinguish between three broad categories of costs, each with different sub-categories. These include course provision (trainer costs, cost of programme development, materials, related services, and cost of advising), teacher participation (cost of teacher time and/or replacement, travel, and residency), and supportive services (administration, overall planning, use of building and facilities). Naturally, it must be remembered that any category of costs contains some arbitrariness and can be handled so as to magnify or diminish certain costs.

In addition, it may be helpful to compare the total national cost of INSET with what is spent on initial teacher training. Two case studies provide us with an opportunity to do this, although once again it must be remembered that very different methods of calculation are involved. In England, the total cost given for INSET in 1973-74 was about a quarter of what was spent on initial teacher training in that same year(10). The Swedish case study, although warning that uncertainties are involved in estimating the total cost of initial training, notes that total INSET cost was about three quarters of the cost of initial teacher training in 1978-79(11).

Another way of comparing INSET spending is to compare expenditure per teacher in the teacher population. Figures of this sort are given in some of the studies, but, for the reasons mentioned above, they are not very comparable. When it is possible to calculate several such per teacher expenditure figures within the same country, these figures may be useful on a national level.

A very approximate picture of the United States federal government effort can be obtained by dividing the total of Table 6 by the figure of 3 million staff given in the 1976 OECD INSET national report, resulting in a rate of U.S. $167 per staff member(12). The U.S. case study gives Florida's rate as $118 per teacher and Palm Beach's rate as $128 per teacher(13). The high federal spending rate can partly be explained by the fact that federal money is development or "seed" money, and thus slanted more toward programmes like INSET, as well as by the fact that costs were calculated in very different ways for these different results.

---

(10) Bradley, op. cit., page 58.

(11) Henricson, op. cit., page 24.

(12) K.R. Howey, "Current Perspectives and Evolving Trends in In-Service Education in the United States", in Innovation in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers, United States, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1976.

(13) Thurber, op. cit., pages 29, 33.

Some readers might wish for a more truly comparative international study of costs, including comparison of per teacher costs in a single monetary unit. Important contextual differences make this enterprise rather hazardous. A truly comparative study should take into account not only the different ways of calculating INSET costs and of defining INSET in different countries, but also the importance of INSET versus continuing education in other professions or even adult education in general. The structure of higher education and differences between primary and secondary education may also have an important effect on INSET costs. Finally, how is one to correct for arbitrarily fluctuating exchange rates? Could a day's pay at the national minimum wage be taken as a common unit? Why not a day's pay for a teacher? Is teacher pay really an independent measure, since teachers' salaries account for a large part of INSET costs? And suppose teachers at different levels are paid differently?

In fact, such international comparisons are not only difficult, but relatively useless. Suppose it is found that more is spent on INSET in Country A than in Country B. Should Country A thus decide to spend more, or Country B less? Who should be proud and who should be ashamed? Rarely are these kinds of decisions made in an international context; they are rather the subject of a national policy debate. Better information within each national unit on cost and resource utilisation would therefore seem more relevant to decision-making.

2.2 Regional and Local INSET Costs

Three of the case studies give some picture of what costs are at the regional or local level responsible for education. The data for England and Wales are the most complete. Here the Department of Education and Science organised a survey of local educational authorities, which yielded the data presented in Table C on the following page. Data concerning individual school districts in England, the United States, and Australia are given in tables included within the country overviews in Appendix II.

In general, data on local costs is presented in an even more varied fashion in these few samples than it was in national costs, so that generalising about them is even more difficult. Cost of secondment (teacher release or substitutes) seems important when it is included, as does teacher travel and/or residence, especially in rural areas in Florida and Australia. Salaries of trainers and advisors appear more important in some cases, less in others. However, it is relatively easy for local authorities to change budgetary formats to make some costs more prominent and others "hidden". Also, in most such budgets, individuals' estimations of use of time can be a distorting factor.

TABLE C

Local Authority Induction and In-Service Training Expenditures in England and Wales, 1977-78

(in thousands of pounds)

Financial Year/ Type of Authority	Salaries and expenses			Training Costs					
	Salary costs of released teachers	Teachers' expenses	Salary costs of advisers	In Schools	In Teachers of professional centres	In Higher and Further Education Centres	Elsewhere	Other Costs	Total of cols. 1:8
Induction: Cost	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1977-78									
ILEA and Outer London Boroughs	90	3	200	28	16	1		19	357
Metropolitan Districts	330	57	292	13	237	6	8	53	996
Non Metropolitan Counties (England)	439	45	716	118	62	3	27	13	1,423
Welsh Counties	42	4	86	26	2	-	-	4	164
Total	901	109	1,294	185	317	10	35	89	2,940
1978-79 (estimated)	Estimate for cols. 1:3			Estimate for cols. 4:8					
ILEA and Outer London Boroughs	518			119					637
Metropolitan Districts	778			254					1,032
Non Metropolitan Counties (England)	1,753			238					1,991
Welsh Counties	217			36					253
Total	3,266			647					3,913
In-Service Training: Cost									
1977-78									
ILEA and Outer London Boroughs	2,447	651	1,149	40	626	90	7	166	5,176
Metropolitan Districts	4,869	685	1,820	145	1,145	229	293	49	9,235
Non Metropolitan Counties (England)	10,614	2,468	4,626	190	2,694	1,848	134	224	22.798
Welsh Counties	701	190	835	1	163	83	28	-	2,001
Total	18,631	3,994	8,430	376	4,628	2,250	462	439	39,210
1978-79(estimated)	Estimate for cols. 1:3			Estimate for cols. 4:8					
ILEA and Outer London Boroughs	5,176			985					6,161
Metropolitan Districts	8,182			2,174					10,356
Non Metropolitan Counties (England)	18,883			5,559					24,442
Welsh Counties	2,070			354					2,424
Total	34,311			9.072					43,383
Induction and In-Service Training:Cost									
1977-78									
ILEA and Outer London Boroughs	2,537	654	1,349	68	642	91	7	185	5,533
Metropolitan Districts	5,199	742	2,112	158	1,382	235	301	102	10,231
Non Metropolitan Counties (England)	11,053	2,513	5,342	308	2,756	1,851	161	237	24,221
Welsh Counties	743	194	921	27	165	83	28	4	2,165
Total	19,532	4,103	9,724	561	4,945	2,260	497	528	42,150
1978-79 (estimated)	Estimate for cols. 1:3			Estimate for cols. 4:8					
ILEA and Outer London Boroughs	5,694			1,104					6,798
Metropolitan Districts	8,960			2,428					11,388
Non Metropolitan Counties (England)	20,636			5,797					26,433
Welsh Counties	2,287			390					2,677
Total	37,577			9,719					47,296

Source: "Induction and In-Service Training of Teachers: 1978 Survey", Statistical Bulletin, Issue 8/78, December. 1978, Department of Education and Science, London.

A standardisation of local costs along the lines suggested above for national costs would appear particularly useful. First, it might be helpful to present not only line-item type categories (salaries, premises, etc.) but also two other dimensions: who pays for these different costs and what costs are associated with what activities. Some of the confusion about how to treat what happens in teacher centres (contrast the treatment in national and local English data) may be caused by the fact that, in part, teacher centres represent a series of line-item expenses, and, in part, a distinct activity with a distinct philosophy. A more systematic and standardized treatment of line-item type categories in the three broad categories of provision, teacher participation, and supportive services might also help. In certain of the tables, the share of the different kinds of supportive services (administration, overall planning, and use of building and facilities) is particularly unclear.

Undoubtedly, different groups connected with INSET will object to certain of these categories, and others will want more sub-categories in certain sections to describe their activities. Nevertheless, it is important to move toward a more complete and agreed upon categorisation of costs.

2.3 Programme Costs

The data base from which to compare programme costs is even more diverse than national costs, since we are dealing not only with different countries and systems but also with different kinds of programmes. These costs are rarely reported using the same methods, since data is usually second and third hand. Nevertheless, by comparing key cost factors, certain patterns appear.

Policy-makers at all levels are interested in knowing which programmes are more expensive. This depends primarily, of course, on the length of the course. We will return to this problem in discussing the cost per participant hour. It is also important to know where the principal costs lie in each kind of programme and if anything can be done about them.

The ideal would be to compare the cost distribution of similarly structured programmes with similar ends in the same country and, with reservations, in different countries. However, the data at hand do not permit such exact comparisons. This is understandable, given the peripheral nature of INSET in many systems. Nevertheless, future INSET programmes might consider trying to keep a more systematic record of costs.

One problem in systematic costing of INSET is how to count the time teachers and others volunteer.

It seems unfair not to count voluntary contributions of teacher time as a cost, because individuals and the community concerned are using a resource that could be used in other ways. When an activity is carried out in teacher time rather than in school time, the cost burden is to some extent simply being shifted from one participant to another. However, none of the case studies attempted to include voluntary teacher time in their budgets. This is understandable, as cost experts have a hard time estimating such costs(14). To make up for this lack, we have included teacher time as a factor to be considered in sources of finance for INSET, and I have added estimates of the cost of time teachers spend in course groups into existing budgets, whenever possible, if they were lacking.

A recent OECD study supports this attempt to include the cost of voluntary contributions of teacher time, as well as other indirect costs which do not usually appear on the budgets of educational agencies. In comparing educational expenditures in France, Japan, and the United Kingdom, the study used as its basis, the economic concept of cost, including the opportunity cost of all resources used in education. Among these were earnings foregone by students and potential rent of buildings(15).

With the data at hand, we can nevertheless get a general idea of the relative importance of different kinds of costs in different countries and programmes. More exact comparisons must await detailed case studies of each INSET course or institution. Three kinds of programmes will be considered: teacher centres, medium length courses, and longer courses.

In my review of costs, I have tended to lump induction together with regular in-service courses. This was done for two reasons. First, there is an insufficient data base concerning the cost of induction per se. Second, in terms of delivery of services, induction courses seem little different from regular in-service courses. The Liverpool case study notes that:

> "As much of the provision for induction was clearly of use to teachers later in their service and much general in-service work was of value to New Teachers, great value could be gained on many occasions from New Teachers and their more experienced colleagues working and learning together"(16).

---

(14) See J. Vaizey, E. Hewton, and K. Norris, The Cost of New Educational Technologies, Fundaçao Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisbon, 1971, page 57. One attempt in this direction is made in the English case study; see note to Table E below.

(15) L. Lévy-Garboua, S. Newman, T. Noda, A. Peacock, T. Watanabe, and M. Woodhall, Educational Expenditure in France, Japan, and the United Kingdom, OECD, Paris, 1977, pages 10 and 322-324.

(16) W.L. Moore, "An LEA Case Study - Liverpool" in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Cost and Financial Implications - II The British Example, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978, page 88.

This lumping together of induction and in-service does not mean to imply that the two are the same from an educational point of view, but rather in terms of their cost structure. Where a sufficient number of induction programmes exist, e.g. in England, one might be justified in costing them separately.

In addition, no attempt was made to distinguish between system-wide INSET, as a part of system-wide reform in education, and continuing local INSET in response to individual needs. Data did not permit this.

2.3.1 Teacher Centres

Figures are available for England and Australia: (See Table D and English country overview). For the reasons mentioned above, the cost of teacher time is generally not included. It is particularly hard to estimate in the case of informal teacher centre activity. Without teacher time, the largest cost item thus appears to be salaries in almost all cases. The range of salaries as a part of total costs is from about 1/3 to 2/3.

Admittedly, the category "salaries" is a simplification and does not distinguish between provision and support services. Teacher centre wardens can serve as advisors or providers of services, as developers of individual courses, and as administrative managers. Each centre must be studied in depth as far as this is concerned.

The second largest item in teacher centre costs is almost always the yearly equivalent cost of the premises, including overhead, when this cost is included in calculations. The third largest item is equipment, materials, or consumable items; it is occasionally more than building costs.

In general, it is interesting to note that the differences between the two countries are less important than the differences between individual centres, and that some general patterns do emerge. The wide variety of centre organisations and operations, as well as different ways of calculating costs, undoubtedly account for the differences.

2.3.2 Medium Length Courses

Certain patterns are also observable with respect to medium length courses (about 20 to 100 hours). (See Table E and country overviews.) Most medium length courses included in the tables have teacher release as their greatest cost, followed by building costs or travel and/or residency costs when included, or in some cases by cost of trainers. More rarely, materials might take up a large second or third place in costs. Again, similarities across borders appear to be stronger than similarities between programmes in the same country with very different structures. However, we are skating on thinner ice, with fewer and more diverse examples as a basis for generalisation. The different case studies also differ greatly in the ways in which they have grouped, added, or left out certain categories of cost.

TABLE D

The Recurrent and Capital Costs Associated with the Operation of Seven Education Centres in Australia (1976)

Type of Costs	Education Centres						
	I	II	III	IV ($'000)	V	VI	VII
A. Equivalent annual[1] investment in:							
a) buildings	16.0	12.1	10.0	25.7	15.2	8.2	4.4
b) equipment and library materials	4.1	5.5	1.8	4.9	5.0	2.3	0.8
B. Recurrent costs							
1. Maintenance and building operation costs	5.2	1.3	3.0	7.0	10.6	5.1	1.8
2. Salaries							
a. professional	36.0	21.0	16.0	18.0	16.5	17.5	2.5
b. other	11.0	12.0	3.5	32.0	15.2	9.0	3.0
3. Consumable items	5.2	12.6	1.6	9.0	12.2	13.3	4.2
4. Other administrative costs	2.1	4.0	3.7	1.2	9.7	2.0	1.2
Total costs	79.6	68.5	39.6	97.8	84.4	57.4	17.9

---

[1] Equivalent annual investments have been calculated by taking the original investment and calculating the annual interest on this investment using Commonwealth interest rates.

Source: P. Cameron, "The Australian Example" in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Cost and Financing Implications - I The Australian and United States' examples, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

Note: Education Centres are those teacher centres funded by the central government.

TABLE E

Cost of Hypothetical 40 Hours Course (England)

	Regional Residential	Regional non-residential	3 local half-day release courses
	5 days	7 days	12 weeks
Lecture fees and tutor's fees	£ 400	£ 400	£ 800
Materials	100	100	100
Tutors' residence or meals	90	32	-
Tutor's travel	12	84	36
Teachers' residence or meals	1800	630	-
Teachers' travel	120	840	360
Teacher replacement	6750	6750(*)	8100
Total cost	9272	8836	9396
Cost to LEA if it pays 2/3 subsistence	8672	8626	9396

(*) more if the weekend is not used.

Note: In each case the teachers give some of their own time for the courses; evenings in the residential course, the weekend on the non-residential course and an extra 1½ hours each week on the half-day release courses serving small local groups. The cost differences between the different formats are very small compared with the total and the rank order of expense can be changed by minor changes in the assumptions made. The only way in which a major saving can be made is to stage the courses in the teachers' own time, the vacation for the first two and evenings for the third. It can be seen from this Table that the average cost of a course of 40 hours length is about £150 per teacher whatever form of organisation is chosen for it, provided that the format involves release from school and replacement of the teacher concerned.

Source: H.W. Bradley, In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Cost and Financing Implications - II The British Example, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978, page 30. Costs calculated for 60 participants.

2.3.3 Longer INSET Courses

The few examples of longer forms of INSET costed in the case studies (over 100 hours long) generally show teacher release as the largest item and trainer costs and salaries as important also or, for the Swedish course, travel and boarding costs.(See Tables 5,6,7,13,17 and 19 in Appendix II.) No exact budget is given for English Open University INSET, but it can be more or less expensive than regular university, depending on course enrolments and taking all costs into account, such as research(17). Nevertheless, Open University seems to be popular with teachers as an alternative to part-time study outside school time, since Open University allows more flexibility in making use of free time(18). (Unfortunately, no cost data were given for year-long accredited university courses in other countries.)

Tutoring or advisory services are not costed here, since, in general, their cost is simply a function of tutor salary and the number of teachers served. Other factors, such as use of building, teacher time, etc., are marginal and hard to measure.

2.3.4. Conclusions

The diversity of the data represented in tables reproduced here and in Appendix II make it hard to draw any clear conclusions. Rather, one can only advance a number of hypotheses. First, it appears that costing patterns are more similar for the same kinds of courses in different countries than for all courses in the same country. One notable exception is the importance of travel and residence costs in situations of geographical dispersion. Second, concerning these different kinds of courses one might observe the following: Teacher centres appear to be less expensive at first glance, because teacher time is usually not costed. Costs in teacher centres are, above all, in staff salaries and secondly in building and equipment or, less frequently, materials. The cost of medium length courses, which appear moderately expensive, usually includes a dominant figure for teacher release if fairly counted, often around 2/3 - 3/4 of the total costs, followed by other items, most commonly travel and/or residency, around 1/5, and less commonly, salaries of trainers, which usually takes a comfortable third. Longer forms of INSET, in the few examples given still show release as the major cost item, but other factors like staff salary can come closer to them. Since release is a "fixed" cost item in relation to time input, one might expect certain longer courses to be the most expensive.

Another way of looking at the problem is to try to take into account all the resources used. In this perspective, teacher centres lose their advantage, as voluntary contributions of teacher time are counted as a cost. Some teacher centres may even be more expensive than average, if their facilities are often idle. Longer courses often mobilize good parts of their participants' leisure time; in counting this time, their per hour cost becomes more like that of other courses.

---

(17) Bradley, op. cit., pages 40-41.

(18) Moore, op. cit., page 73.

The debate on which kind of courses is more expensive is complicated by the question of research expenses in INSET. Counting research expenses directly connected with courses would make certain longer and more innovative courses look more expensive. Yet INSET courses connected with research may be an economy for the nation, as one is "killing two birds with one stone".

It would be tempting at this point to try to measure the unit cost of the different programmes reported on here. The most satisfactory measure would be the cost per participant hour, that is, the total cost, divided by the number of hours of course time and the number of participants. However, the problems connected with the different ways in which costs are measured for different courses, especially different ways of measuring the cost of teacher time, plus the difficulties associated with assessing how much time participants really do spend with each course, make the exact nature of such figures on cost per participant hour illusory.

In order for this kind of comparison to become possible, more detailed case studies of individual programmes must be done, so that all relevant costs are included. The English case study's estimation of the cost of medium length courses (Table E) provides an example of a more complete coverage of provision and teacher participation. The cost of an Australian residential centre, Table 10 in Appendix II provides an example of more complete coverage of support services costs. Finally, the French summer institute, Table F, provides an example of general coverage of all relevant factors. This is a particularly noteworthy achievement, since it is based on data from a voluntary association, where little actual expenses occurred. The format may appear confusing at first, but it allows one to see at a glance which were actual expenses and which were imputations or opportunity costs. Making imputations and relying on people's estimates has its dangers, but it is necessary to compare diverse kinds of programmes. Incidentally, the estimates in the French examples are backed up by other tables and calculations of proportion of salaries attributable to course time, hypothetical rent of classroom space, price of railway transportation, etc. The distinction made between "training" and "associated" expenditures, made in the French study, may be valid for educational expenses in general (a case of trying to distinguish teaching from school lunches), but I believe, need not be retained for INSET, since travel and boarding are an integral part of cost variables, as the example of the English medium length courses shows.

The ultimate purpose of such more accurate figures is not to make international comparisons, but rather, to compare the unit cost of different kinds of INSET within the same country. The results may not be very spectacular; the English case study notes that a week's worth of university study seems to cost as much as a week-long intensive course(19). Nevertheless, they will provide a starting point for decision-making about costs.

---

(19) Bradley, op. cit., page 39

TABLE F

Cost of two Summer Institutes and Related Headquarters Costs of the "Cercles de recherche et d'action pédagogiques" (1977, France)

(Yearly)	Expenditures		Imputations		Costs		Source of Financing
	Expenditures	Associated	Training Costs	Associated	Training Costs	Associated	
Meetings							
Teacher Trainers Costs (opportunity costs in this case)	-	-	8,757	-	8,757	-	Contribution of the Participants to the meetings: 220 persons (+ 30 discussion leaders who are not paying) i.e. 220 x 450 F. = 99,000 F.
Teachers' salaries (or opportunity costs)			119,891		119,891		
Pay of replacement Teachers	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Premises	20,000		561		20,561		
Equipment (running costs for buildings included in cost of hiring premises)	-	-	-	-	-	-	The remaining part of the total is used to cover administrative expenditures
Associated							
(travel costs)				42,000		42,000	
(board and lodging costs)		80,000				80,000	
TOTAL	20,000	80,000	129,209	42,000	149,209	122,000	
Headquarters							
(Administration)							
Personnel			15,600		15,600		
Premises	8,000				8,000		
Equipment	4,000				4,000		
TOTAL	12,000		15,600		27,600		

Source: S. Henriques et R. Terrier, La Formation continue des enseignants en France. Coûts monétaires et coûts économiques. Quatre études de cas, Equipe Politique de l'Education, Université de Paris VIII - Vincennes (n.d. unpublished manuscript).

Note: The "Cercles" is a voluntary association of teachers and educators. The 1977 Summer institutes brought together 220 teachers and persons interested in education from different regions of France.

There seems to be a fear among some that, in a period of economic crisis, certain forms of INSET will be promoted because they are less expensive, regardless of their educational merits. The temptation seems especially great in connection with certain forms of distance teaching or school-based INSET. They seem on the surface to be so much less expensive, since they use less staff or school time. Detailed study of course structure and comparison with similarly structured courses may lead to slightly different conclusions, as calculations concerning the English Open University and the DLH multi-media courses, discussed above, have shown. However, suppose substantial cost differences remain? The only way to "defend" the more expensive programmes is to be able to distinguish more clearly between different kinds of INSET objectives and results. We must also remember that allocation of resources has a symbolic as well as a utilitarian value; more costly can also mean more prestigious.

More significant to my mind is the importance of certain key cost factors in INSET budgets. The over-riding one is teacher release. In addition, this factor is relatively easily varied, at least in public budgets, by asking more or less free time of teachers. This still represents a hidden cost to the nation, as they might do something else just as constructive with their free time. Costs of travel and/or residence also appear to be important, especially in situations with large geographical dispersion like Australia, but also in Sweden and France. Thus, distance teaching, as through radio, can have a definite place in INSET. Examples of relatively less expensive INSET courses using distance teaching such as through Open University in England, and especially the radio course in Australia(20), while not convincing on its universal value or economy, argue for its use in certain specific situations: large audience, a limited number of course meetings, and, perhaps, shorter courses or those where participants can lead some discussions. Finally, in certain specific kinds of INSET, the cost of buildings, including both capital and overhead costs, and the cost of materials and equipment, could be levers for cost control.

---

(20) Cameron, op. cit. page 28. The very low cost given of Australian $6.32 per day included only production and distribution costs. The OECD study of new materials in INSET, while agreeing that large-scale media programmes such as the Open University have a continuing role to play, argues for more local, small-scale media projects as requiring a smaller initial investment and as being more suited to locally-focused INSET: P. Döbrich, C. Kodron, J. Lynch, In-Service Education and Training of Teachers: Towards New Policies, The Utilisation of New Materials, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1980.

III. FINANCING

The present chapter considers how financial resources are used to meet the various costs described in the previous chapter. It focuses on the relative distribution of the financial burden among actors in INSET and on explanations for this distribution. The next chapter will consider the question of enlisting new, and often non-financial resources.

3.1. Patterns of INSET Finance

Summary descriptions of patterns of INSET finance in individual countries are to be found in the country overviews in the Appendix. The following are a few broad generalisations based on these descriptions.

Three of the five countries studied handle education in general and INSET in particular in a basically decentralised fashion. In these countries, central government financing is aimed more at new and innovative programmes; in some cases, this financing is growing in importance. These funds have often been helpful in starting or maintaining teacher centres. Central governments also support INSET indirectly through more general grants to local educational or government authorities and through financial support to colleges and universities. Yet it is local authorities which are the main financers of INSET. They pay most replacement costs and provide most administrative and some specialist personnel for local courses. Colleges and universities are the third biggest source of funds in these countries. Teachers as individuals also contribute large amounts of time to INSET, although this is hard to total up. Other financers of INSET include teachers' unions and subject associations, other government units, private businesses, and foundations.

Denmark is an intermediate case between centralisation and decentralisation. Education is generally decentralised, but most INSET is run through central institutions like the DLH. Yet local authorities contribute greatly, especially through local study days.

Sweden is the only centralised state whose finances were documented, and Table A, above, naturally shows the predominance of central finance. Yet much of the money is channelled through local authorities.

In my opinion, few miraculous solutions to the quest for new sources of funding are evident from the case studies. New ideas may be gleaned for specific local situations, for instance by the method of the resource table suggested in the previous chapter. As a general rule, it would seem advantageous to attach INSET to other social functions besides childhood education. Funds for the latter tend to be limited at present. Examples of other social functions are adult education(21), training of other social service workers, and problems of urban minorities. However, the advantages of these funds must be weighed against the special character of INSET, especially the specific governance system that it has evolved in different national contexts(22).

One of the few general solutions that may lead to substantial economies is the use of pre-service interns as substitutes for regular teachers who then take INSET on released time. Two examples of this are given in the United States case study(23). France also uses this system at one level; teacher training interns do for primary school three months of practice teaching in their last year of training, thus freeing up primary school teachers for long or medium-length INSET(24). In the United States, other kinds of "free" substitutes have been used, including university personnel connected with INSET. As the cost of replacing teachers is the major INSET cost, it might be worthwhile investigating whether this solution could be applied more generally despite possible contextual constraints.

3.2 Financing Teacher Time in INSET: the Search for Guidelines

Aside from the few general solutions like that mentioned above, the debate on INSET finance soon narrows down to the question of how to distribute the financial burden most equitably and with the most positive consequences for INSET activities. Here probably the most obvious central question is: who pays for the time that teachers spend in INSET. A review of the different case studies shows a lack of an established pattern in this area. Even within individual countries, the percentage of course hours of INSET run on school time can vary. In Australia, the percentage of INSET days on school time varies from 70 per cent to 20 per cent(25).

---

(21) One example of successful integration of INSET and adult education activities is in certain teacher centres in Australia (B. Fallon and F. Fallon, "Teachers Centres in Australia", in: In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Towards School-Focused Training - V Teacher Centres in Australia and the United Kingdom, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978, pages 10-11.

(22) Bradley, op. cit., pages 64-65.

(23) Thurber, op. cit., pages 14-15.

(24) Belbenoit, op. cit. page 21.

(25) Cameron, op. cit., page 21.

In England, secondment for long courses has been cut greatly(26) although there are signs that this trend may be reversing. In Florida, the portion of an LEA's INSET budget devoted to teacher release can vary from 2 per cent to 65 per cent(27). If there is any one activity that tends to be carried on most often in teacher time, it is teachers centres, especially in their informal consulting role. Part-time study for awards is also frequently mentioned as going on in teacher time, although this varies. In contrast, study days seem most frequently to occur in school time, and short courses are rather more likely to be in school time as well, although generalisation here is also difficult.

The problem of paying for teacher time in INSET is linked to the more general problem of school finance in the four decentralised countries. Teacher release for INSET is most often paid for by the local school authorities. These, in turn, often depend on local taxes for marginal revenue, and these local taxes often tend to be more regressive than national taxes. The professional improvement needs of teachers are thus weighed against the basic needs of the average citizen.

3.2.1 A Rule of Thumb: Systems Needs versus Individual Needs

Questions of basic INSET policy are also involved here. Some argue that it is important to distinguish between system needs, the needs of schools, that is, and individual needs, that is, those of individual teachers, especially their career promotion needs. Many of the systems studied would undoubtedly invoke this argument to justify not paying for certain kinds of teacher time. And it might be possible to establish some clear limit cases: When a school system decides unilaterally that its teachers must be retrained, for instance, to implement a new curriculum, this is a system need. When an individual seeks further education to qualify him or herself to move up or even out of the system, this could be called an individual need.

There is one case of INSET which is generally recognised by all parties as being an individual need , rather than a collective need. This case consists of instances where an individual teacher seeks to further his or her own general education without any direct reference to school-related goals or awards, by attending courses not intended for INSET. However, examples of this clear-cut case are hard to find. The Open University general education courses in England, for instance, lead to degrees valid for educational systems, and course costs for them can be subsidised by local authorities(28).

---

(26) Bradley, op. cit., page 57.

(27) Thurber, op. cit., pages 30-31.

(28) Bradley, op. cit., page 40 and Moore, ibid., page 73.

Other arguments could be offered in favour of the systems needs-individual needs distinction. A stronger argument might be that, at present teachers' free time is used for a large part of INSET courses. This situation is unlikely to change greatly, given present economic conditions. Would it not be better to apportion more rationally the kinds of INSET done on school time, instead of letting a chaotic situation prevail where the kinds and amounts of INSET with and without release vary greatly from one district to another?

3.2.2 Objections to this Rule and a Possible Middle Ground

The systems need-individual need distinction has provoked objections from several quarters. First, teachers individually and in unions are usually against it and prefer the maximum amount of released time possible. Second, the varied practices of funding INSET illustrate the difficulties of distinguishing between the two kinds of needs. Third, the distinction goes against certain current INSET theories which seek to bring the two needs closer together, for instance, teacher participation in governance and school-based INSET. Fourth, individual career promotion can itself serve systems needs. The study of British teacher centres notes this phenomenon, in contrasting system-run with teacher centre courses, and comments:

> One way in which local educational authorities can control curriculum development is to identify those whose ways accord with their views, and then to support and to promote them(29).

These objections illustrate the problem of the multiple and interrelated purposes of INSET, discussed in the OECD report on INSET evaluation.

Finally, social policies such as distinguishing between individual and system needs often have unintended negative social consequences. The Danish case study notes that an increase in released time granted to teachers has not so much increased dramatically application figures as changed the composition of those attending DLH courses (which, incidentally, have limited enrolment). With more release, those with personal resources enabling them to give part or all of their free time to study are joined by those who previously had to work extra hours inside or outside school(30). The Australian study points out that purely voluntary INSET courses outside school hours will attract only "the few people who are enthusiastic about their professional development"(31). Holding INSET courses outside school time may also increase the problem of dropouts from courses. (Dropouts in INSET courses can be a major problem. Only 17,600 of 35,000 Swedish teachers completed the three year series of SOS - the voluntary multi-media course on individualised instruction)(32).

---

(29) A. Griggs and J. Gregory: "Teachers Centres in the United Kingdom"in: In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Towards school-focused Training - Teachers Centres in Australia and the United Kingdom, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978, page 34.

(30) Andersen and Olsen, op. cit., page 40.

(31) Cameron, op. cit., page 27.

The distinction between systems needs and individual needs in INSET Finance is more or less well accepted, depending on national contexts. In the English-speaking countries surveyed here (England, Australia, and the United States), the concept of "staff development" is widely accepted. This concept implies that system goals and individual development goals can be reconciled. It is also favoured by present demographic trends toward stable staff. On the other hand, in more centralised systems like Sweden and France, the distinction between systems needs and individual needs seems to fit better. Yet even when "staff development" is an avowed goal, individual districts must make decisions about which kind of programmes to sponsor, based on some systemic criteria.

Discussion about actual practice among specialists from different countries has pointed out what may be a synthesis of the two points of view: Decision-making about what teacher time should be paid for by school systems will naturally be based on a relative ordering of priorities. In times of scarcity such as these, the nature of these priorities becomes more crucial. In the last instance, it would not be surprising if most systems put systems needs before individual needs. Yet it is important that, by giving priority to systems needs, systems do not neglect the needs of individual teachers and staff upon whom the system is based.

3.2.3 Related Questions of Teacher Motivation

The choice means for financing teacher time in INSET is related to the complex question of what motivations are most effective for attending INSET. As was mentioned above, relying on purely voluntary initiative may attract only the enthusiastic few. On the other hand, most case study writers are wary of relying too much on compulsion and extrinsic motivation for INSET, for instance, through obligatory INSET during school time. The Australian case study notes that under the latter conditions,

> ... the scope of professional development is likely to be decreased, because participants will be less enthusiastic if they do not attend voluntarily(33).

The United States case study cites a Rand study showing that extrinsic motivating forces for INSET performance may back-fire, causing lessened interest(34).

---

(32) S. Marklund and H. Eklund, Innovation in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers, Sweden, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1976.

(33) Cameron, op. cit., page 27.

(34) Thurber, op. cit., pages 9-11.

It may seem difficult to reconcile the supposed dangers of using release as a motivation with the fact that so many teachers campaign for release. Here, theories of motivation taken essentially from practice in industry, like those of Maslow and Herzberg(35), may help. In brief, these theories say that improved material benefits, like pay and working conditions, work to remove dissatisfaction but do not necessarily provide a strong motivating force, especially when complex tasks are involved.

The problem becomes more complex if one attempts to consider various kinds of extrinsic and intrinsic motivations in their different national contexts. In some contexts, extrinsic motivations, such as financial incentives built into salary scales and the need to renew or upgrade credentials (such devices are especially common in the United States) seem to be relatively effective. Yet such incentives have definite disadvantages: Salary hikes can be thought of as a long-term hidden cost of INSET. An emphasis on credentials can lead to "credentialism", or pursuing credentials for their own sake, rather than for their effect on teaching and learning. In some systems, certain kinds of INSET normally are compulsory - such is the case of local study days in Sweden(36). Such is often also the case when sweeping structural or curriculum reforms are mandated from outside the educational system. Other systems, such as DLH, can rely almost entirely on voluntary participation.

---

(35) F. Herzberg and A.H. Maslow. For summaries of their theories, see: R.R. Blake and J.S. Mouton, Consultation, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., United States, 1976, page 409, and C.R. Mill and L.C. Porter, "A Hierarchy of Needs", in Reading Book for Laboratories in Human Relations Training, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioural Science associated with the National Education Association, 1972 Edition, Washington D.C., United States, pages 24-27.

A complementary social science view of the problem comes from Chris Argyris. Argyris notes that, in organisations, when problems to be solved are routine and information is minimally threatening to individuals, commitment need not be internal. When information is nonroutine and information is potentially to the parties concerned, internal commitment (and thus, intrinsic motivation) is needed (Intervention Theory and Method, A Behavioural Science View, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, 1970, pages 56-57). Most INSET, aside from the rote learning of facts, is nonroutine, and it is often reported as potentially threatening to teachers' self-esteem. This view suggests that the degree of intrinsic motivation may vary from one kind of INSET course to another, but, in general, a high degree of intrinsic motivation is necessary.

(36) Henricson, op. cit., pages 6-7.

When speaking of voluntarism and intrinsic motivation, it is also important to be conscious of to what extent the system supports this voluntary action. The high rate of participation of the teaching body in DLH courses is impressive - one third to one fourth participate yearly(37). Yet these courses are supported and organised at government expense, and many teachers secure release from their local schools. Other forms of motivation supporting voluntary action may include having the teacher's supervisor or employer encourage the teacher to take INSET courses. In certain U.S. districts, this encouragement has been formalised to a point where supervisor and teacher hold periodic conferences and co-operatively plan the teacher's future INSET activity(38). On the other hand, certain voluntary actions receive relatively little systemic support. Certain voluntary organisations of French secondary school teachers, such as the one illustrated in the chapter on costs, are run almost entirely on contributions of time and money from members, aside from building space for courses donated for free by some secondary schools or universities. Attendance at these courses is generally small.

Finally, indirect motivations imbedded in the structure of an educational system may encourage voluntary participation. Here again, the Danish example is the most striking: the system of national participatory governance and especially the way in which the principal primary school teacher follows his class, discussed in the introductory section on national contexts, help to explain the high degree of voluntary participation.

In conclusion, the mix of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation needed to make an INSET course successful, and thus, the degree to which systems must pay for teacher time in INSET, seems to depend greatly on national contexts. Without some kind of material support from the system, INSET may touch only a very small minority. Yet relying entirely on extrinsic motivation may be very costly and not necessarily effective. Other, more intrinsic motivations, based on the system's structure, the teacher's conception of his role, and so on, may be just as important.

3.2.4 Teacher Release and Teacher Professionalism

A final controversy in connection with the financing of teacher release is teacher professionalism. Does the latter mean that teachers must be ready to devote more of their free time to professional upgrading, as the Australian case study seems to imply(39), or does it, on the contrary, mean that their employers owe it to them to give them the means to do a serious job of upgrading? Here again, national contextual factors are paramount. The prevailing idea of teacher and professional varies from one country to another. In addition, teachers' unions and professional associations usually have expressed positions on this question. Finally, the working conditions of teachers vary greatly from one country to another and from one level to another. In Denmark, for instance, it is the preschool teachers who have the most class time and the least free time for INSET, and the amount of free time available progresses as one advances in the educational system all the way to university. Similar conditions exist in other countries. Yet all levels need some INSET. In addition, the degree to which this "free" time is taken up with education-related tasks will vary from one context to another.

---

(37) Andersen and Olsen, op. cit., page 17.

(38) Thurber, op. cit., page 14.

(39) Cameron, op. cit., page 27

3.3 Finance and Control; Finance and Participation

The case studies show how financing INSET poses other problems. If the above problem may be called, "He who benefits, finances", there exists a parallel idea that "He who finances, controls". As in the above problem, one can cite examples both for and against this proposition. The wariness of local governments toward earmarked central government grants for education is such an example. So also are attempts of some local school districts, for instance in the United States, to have more influence in teacher centre governance. On the other hand, many teacher centres seem to have a fairly autonomous existence despite outside funding, and teachers have succeeded in gaining a large amount of control over certain central government funds, as in Denmark - Teachers have a large voice in DLH governance, and high school teachers' unions help run their level's INSET with central government funds through union-ministry committees(40).

Much seems to depend on traditions of institutional governance and inter-institutional relations. In the above example in Denmark, student participation in governance is a part of the general university structure. In many countries, there is an active rivalry between central and local government units over control of marginal areas like education; in England, for instance, specific "earmarked" central government grants for INSET purposes, such as for paying teacher release, are seen as a threat to local autonomy(41). Similarly, INSET in at least two countries has become involved in the problems of creating new regional levels of government. In England, a Royal Commission is investigating devolution of governmental powers to regions(42). In Australia, INSET is part of a trend of devolution of powers to regions and groups within existing states(43).

In a similar vein, one might advance examples for and against the propositions that, "He who participates in planning, helps finance", and "He who chooses, pays". Notable examples where this is true are in certain teacher centres, where teacher free choice corresponds with large inputs of teacher time, and in different consortium operations. (This might be termed a financial argument for participatory planning.) In other cases, local or regional units may participate in decisions about the use of central government funds without being willing to add of their own.

---

(40) Andersen and Olsen, op. cit., page 10.

(41) Bradley, op. cit., page 9.

(42) Ibid, page 8.

(43) Cameron, op. cit., pages 35-36.

3.4 Conclusion: Difficult Choices and the Role of Central Government

The questions of INSET finance appear as a complex series of difficult choices. First, one must either try to enlarge the share of money alloted to INSET or try to divide the often meager share in some different way. To enlarge this share, one must in most cases appeal to a public, either local or national. One must first believe that INSET is just as or more important than other, more tangible educational or social services. This is not always easy or easy to convey, when forms of INSET are diverse, as are results. Second, the public must believe more in INSET. This can mean "selling" INSET to the public, or hopefully rather mean bringing INSET more into line with public objectives for education, for instance, through community-based schemes discussed in the United States' studies(44). Of course, the degree of "selling" or alignment necessary depends on national contexts.

If the effort to enlarge INSET money fails, then one is left with a sort of "shrinking pie" phenomenon - as the resource pie gets smaller, people fight over it more. In addition, all participants in INSET are left with a series of unattractive trade-offs. One of the most difficult is that of whether to favour more quantity or quality in INSET. In Australia, tension arose between the central government and local school authorities over this issue. The central government wanted to push for more long-range courses, while local authorities at one time favoured shorter courses that could reach maximum numbers(45). Some mixture of quantity and quality is inevitable, but what mixture? Again, the variety of INSET courses and objectives confuses the problem. However, more research results on the relative effectiveness of different kinds of courses, long and short, would help here, too.

One can imagine other trade-offs specific groups are faced with. Trainers, for instance, must choose between training teachers, training selves, and research. Local schools must choose between subject - and methods - oriented INSET, among other things. In times of stringency, one can always hope to find solutions that will perform several functions at once - the Danish study gives some example of these(46). However, there is reason to fear that choices representing longer term investments with more deferred results will suffer. There is even a danger that, if this kind of policy continues over long periods, the "capital" represented by teaching knowledge and skill will decrease over the long run, for instance, by not being adapted to current pupil or social needs. Yet no easy solutions are at hand.

---

(44) The Australia case study emphasizes this problem: "... the failure of planners and the public to take account of the way INSET programmes facilitate the achievement of broad educational objectives is a major reason why funds for INSET have not traditionally been readily accommodated in education budgets". (Cameron, op. cit., page 38).

(45) ibid., pages 29-30.

It is with these difficult choices in mind, and not without some misgivings, that I come back to the central government's pivotal role in financing INSET. In contrast to local government, the central government has a more progressive tax structure, a securer financial base, and a habit of dealing in investment goods. Much INSET work is a long-term investment which does not bring as immediate payoff as some educational activities. Central governments are thus in a better position to promote INSET directly and, depending on national financing mechanisms, to give local educational authorities money for this purpose or to provide them with incentives for spending their own money on INSET.

It is interesting to note that the OECD report on financing of primary education has come to similar conclusions about the need for central government financing.

> Far from the higher levels of government stepping in deliberately to buy control of the lower levels, what has apparently happened (according to scattered observations in the country studies) is that, at all levels of government, ever higher levels of service have been demanded, the costs of which have outrun the localities' financial powers. The consequences has been steadily increasing levels of non-local funding, sometimes bringing more non-local control, but sometimes not - depending on the particular grant instruments used(47).

I would like to be as optimistic as this study about the lack of connection between central government financing and control in INSET. However, in INSET, countries with a greater degree of centralised funding of INSET - Sweden, Denmark, and Australia - also seem to show greater central influence over INSET programmes. On the other hand, in England, where general central government funding of education comes without strings, and little specific funding of INSET exists, INSET needs are often reduced on the local level, as the country overview shows.

---

(46) For example, subject and methods teachers jointly give a course which integrates the two aspects of INSET (Andersen and Olsen, op. cit., pages 21-22).

(47) OECD/CERI, Educational Financing and Policy Goals for Primary Schools - General Report, Paris, 1979.

The question is thus not whether central governments should influence state or local units to spend money on INSET. If they do not use this influence, many local units will tend to give INSET needs a low priority (depending, of course, on national contexts). The question is rather how this central government influence can be made least destructive of INSET, as INSET seems to thrive on local initiative and a mixing of resources.

Thus the crucial central government role in financing INSET becomes even more problematic in the face of a trend in many countries favouring local control of finance and education. Examples of this trend in England and Australia were cited earlier. The same trend includes demands for more community participation in the United States and school reform aimed at greater decentralisation in Sweden(48). The central influence necessary for a minimum level of funding must thus be reconciled both with INSET's own needs for local initiative and with citizens' demands for more local influence. Attempting to solve this problem leads necessarily to the next chapter of this study, INSET planning for effective resource utilisation.

IV. PLANNING FOR EFFECTIVE RESOURCE UTILISATION

The questions of major cost factors and who finances INSET, treated in the previous chapters, have raised a number of critical problem areas: cost-effectiveness in INSET, the search for new INSET resources to defuse financial competition, and the crucial but delicate role of central governments. This chapter will outline tentative solutions to these problems, focusing first on questions of resource utilisation and then on questions of planning and organisation.

My position in this chapter is based on a particular point of view. I consider that collaboration between different actors in INSET is a desirable goal. The hope is that both better pedagogical solutions and more efficient use of existing resources will result from such collaboration. Yet collaboration has drawbacks; it creates conflicts between different agents and agencies. Questions of resource utilisation and planning will thus lead to a consideration of specific situations of conflict and collaboration, at the end of this chapter.

4.1 Can we Measure the Cost Effectiveness of INSET Programmes?

4.1.1 Observations from Case Study Writers

Although they were not asked directly to treat this area of concern, all case study writers commented on cost effectiveness or evaluation. The United States' case study writer cites various studies showing that certain kinds of

---

(48) Henricson, op. cit., pages 43-45.

INSET programmes, possessing specific structures, were more effective in achieving their objectives than others. Although wary of a too mechanical approach to the question, he cites a United States study where the per point cost of teacher test score gain was calculated(49). The English case study writer is more cautious in treating questions of INSET effectiveness; he argues that the fit between the individual needs of teachers or schools and individual INSET programmes is just as important(50). The Australian case study writer treats under cost effectiveness questions of cost control and policy options aimed at greater effectiveness, while underlining the problem of multiple INSET objectives(51). The Danish case study writer discusses different evaluation procedures, stressing their political and inter-group implications(52). The Swedish case study writer describes both evaluation procedures and the iterative process by which costs and results of national programmes are taken into account in yearly planning(53).

4.1.2 Problems in Measuring INSET Cost Effectiveness

As the above examples show, questions of INSET cost effectiveness lead directly to questions of evaluation and evaluation methodology, of multiple educational objectives, of the politics of education, and so on. These questions involve serious difficulties for cost effectiveness.

Take, for instance, the question of multiple objectives. INSET, like most educational endeavours, caters to a variety of groups who have a variety of objectives in mind. This makes it difficult to draw upon a single objective of set of objectives, from which criteria for effectiveness can be derived. When different kinds of INSET programmes are being compared, the problems increase. How does one account for differences in length of programmes, in teachers and pupils affected by them, etc.? Will not pushing a single criteria of cost effectiveness tend to influence INSET programmes in the direction of uniformity and discourage the variety of approaches the state of the art seems to warrant? In addition, the quality of much cost data, discussed in the second chapter, does not seem to merit using it as a basis for comparisons of cost-effectiveness. Yet another problem is that of unintended outcomes, especially in more innovative programmes. One such programme, with several unintended outcomes, is the DLH school-based curriculum development programme, described later in this report.

The review of the OECD INSET evaluation case studies treats several of these questions. For instance, it discusses the relationship between different kinds of INSET aims and their relative impact on evaluation activities. However, it provides no solution to problems of cost effectiveness raised here. Rather, it advocates cost effectiveness as a method superior to programme evaluation alone, in certain situations(54).

---

(49) Thurber, op. cit., pages 5, 6, 43, 45, 46, 19.

(50) Bradley, op. cit., pages 16-17, 26-27, 34, 35.

(51) Cameron, op. cit., pages 26, 30-31.

(52) Andersen and Olsen, op. cit., pages 41-48.

(53) Henricson, op. cit., pages 31, 36, 38.

4.1.3 Some Tentative Solutions and Their Implications

Given the above problems in the present state of INSET, a number of responses to the question of cost effectiveness are possible. Certain INSET practitioners may want to reject cost effectiveness altogether, as either not relevant or not applicable under present circumstances. Unfortunately, economic pressures from governmental authorities make it hard to dispose of the question in this way. Another approach is to try to compare costs and results without becoming quantitative. For instance, in a hypothetical situation, one might observe that, in achieving general objective X, type A INSET seems to be this much successful and cost so much, and type B INSET seems to be that much successful and cost so much. One might add that, in addition, types A and B have certain secondary advantages and disadvantages, namely: a,b,c,d... This way of presenting options seems more keyed to a realistic "satisficing" or "incrementalist" mode of operation, rather than a theoretical "maximizing" mode(55).

I suspect that even this approach will not satisfy many of those who must make decisions about educational programmes; it resembles existing practice too much. In fact, in the area of cost effectiveness, there seems to be a certain grouping into the two audiences mentioned in the introduction: government decision-makers and INSET programme specialists. Many governmental decision-makers are interested in seeing an analysis of INSET along the lines of cost effectiveness; they often must justify how they are spending money to some further governmental or public audience. INSET specialists, on the contrary, are wary of cost-effectiveness as an approach which gives a false sense of security based on cost and evaluation figures that hide much uncertainty, and which tend to blur distinctions between kinds of objectives, programmes, and approaches, distinctions which they consider important.

One final kind of response may come closer to satisfying both audiences. One might want to consider, for a given programme, that the objective or objectives are fixed. Different means of reaching this objective are taken to be of about equal effectiveness, and they are compared in terms of their cost. The most obvious example of this is dealing with problems of transportation and lodging for INSET in areas of geographical dispersion. It may be useful to compare the cost of bringing participants to a central training centre, versus sending trainers out to local sites, or some other alternative. Even if distances are small enough so that cost differences are not important, as the hypothetical example of the English case study shows (see Table E above) this result is, in itself useful to decision-makers.

---

(54) G.T. Fox, In-Service Education and Training of Teachers: Towards New Policies Reflecting Upon Evaluation, Synthesis Report, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1980.

(55) The former mode is recommended by W.R. Mulford in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers: Towards New Policies - The Role and Training of Teacher Trainers, Synthesis Report, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1980.

4.2 Maximising Resource Utilisation: the Resource Table

In the introduction, the conflict between the growing demand for INSET and new restrictions on educational budgets was mentioned. The chapter on costs has shown the difficulties involved in assessing cost variables.

Let us now try to look at the economic problems of INSET as existing in an open system, rather than in a closed system. Can any new sets of resources be brought in to enlarge the range of economic choices? What does the experience of the different countries being studied here suggest about using new resources? Can resources already being used for INSET be combined in new ways, to create new possibilities? In a word, I am asking the reader to consider the case for non-traditional use of resources. Later, I will look at the problems posed by this approach, but for the moment I am asking the reader to hold his criticisms in abeyance.

To stimulate thinking on the non-traditional use of resources, I would first like to show the present situation, as described by case study writers and participants in the seminar on INSET costs and resources, by using a resource utilisation table. This table is reproduced in Appendix I. The horizontal lines of the table represent four different kinds of INSET programmes. The number of hours indicated in the first three cases are the number of hours of contact time or class time. The fourth category groups two rather different kinds of INSET activities: tutorial or advising work, in which the number of hours is hard to define because it usually consists of a one-to-one relationship; and consulting work, which also includes much informal contact time but is usually a relationship between an individual consultant and a group or an institution. The four categories are a modified version of categories used in the English case study. The ten vertical columns in the table represent the different resources, agents who provide, organise, fund or host INSET activities.

The classification system used in the table may seem arbitrary to some theorists of INSET. It was chosen for its relative ideological neutrality and its close relationship to practical organisation problems. Other classification systems include the fourteen possible designs of American researcher Gordon Lawrence(56), the five categories of Swedish INSET(57), and Rubin's seven categories(58). The latter states, "Defining in-service is not to be taken lightly"(59). The relations, definitions and typologies to governance and power struggles in INSET.

---

(56) Thurber, op. cit., page 7.

(57) Marklund and Eklund, op. cit.

The format of this table is the result of the suggestions of participants at the April, 1979 meeting at OECD headquarters. In drawing up the present five country table, I have modified only slightly the responses given by participants in their individual country tables. These modifications are mainly in the interest of clarity and unity of presentation. For those who know the INSET situations in these countries, it is evident that the combined table represents individuals' views of INSET in their countries. In certain cases, a resource mentioned in one country could just as well have been mentioned in other countries.

4.2.1 Lessons of the Resource Utilisation Table

What can be learned from such a table? First, a great variety of resources that have been mobilised for INSET in these various countries. To be sure, **not** all countries appear to be as active in mobilising resources as others, but, in certain cases, a more succinct response style can contribute to this appearance. This variety is impressive, especially considering that this mobilisation has taken place in a period of comparative economic scarcity.

Second, many of the holes in the table are suggestive of further steps that could be taken in the non-traditional use of resources. Let us try to suspend for a moment a more detailed analysis of these holes and try to go beyond the problem of individual national contexts discussed in the introduction. Looking at the table in a more general way, several ideas come to mind. Longer courses and advising or consulting work could certainly draw on a greater variety of resources, given a bit of local ingenuity. Radio and television, and distance learning in general, could be used in a greater variety of situations and countries: regional study days, communication between teacher centres, and programmes with INSET experts, followed by telephone call-in sessions. Certain kinds of advising might even be done this way. (The OECD study of the utilisation of new materials for INSET, mentioned above, gives some examples of these new uses of distance learning.) The resources of individual teachers could be used more, in ways depending on local conditions. Subject or professional associations and local schools could be used more, too. Central or regional authorities could do intensive consulting or action research more systematically starting with themselves as models.

---

(58) L. Rubin, Innovation in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers, United States, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1976.

(59) ibid.

This listing of ideas arising from the resource utilisation table suggests a further way of using the table: in national, regional, and local planning. The resource utilisation table can be a means of getting an overview of how potential resources are being used in a given context. Participants in a planning group might want to go through the various steps we are going through in connection with this study: agree on a format for the table, have several people fill out copies of the table, view combined results, note quickly any first impressions about potential resources, and, finally, analyse the results in terms of policy options.

4.3 Trends in Resource Utilisation and their Implications

In a more analytic vein, the table seems to show that, at least in certain countries and contexts, we are moving away from a situation where a specific kind of INSET was the exclusive province of an institution or set of institutions, to one where certain innovative INSET activities involve several institutions and sets of resources at once. One might even distinguish two stages in the process. First, the new resources are involved more peripherally: as hosts, sources of expertise, or funds, and secondly, in some cases, there is a full integration of resources. This trend toward mixing or even integration of resources is most marked in the short courses, and, to some extent, in the medium length courses. Yet examples can be found in the other kinds of INSET.

Such a trend has positive aspects. First, it is a way of getting around present economic difficulties. Indeed, in some cases, economic scarcity has pushed toward a mixing of resources. Second, a mixing of resources, even on a modest level, seems to help in searching for answers to the many questions that remain about INSET content and methods. Of the many examples of innovative resource mixing, let us look at a case in Denmark, where the context does not appear to favour this trend as much.

Based on previous reviews of DLH work, two staff members of that institution decided to try to do curriculum development and further education of teachers at the same time, by working co-operatively with teachers on the premises of the school. Using a normative re-educative strategy, they attempted to act as facilitators in problem-solving. They encountered many difficulties, but their general conclusions from this experience were positive, because of greater teacher involvement, more appropriate course content, and lessons the DLH staff itself had learned(60).

An indiscriminate mixing of resources from different agents or agencies will not necessarily give a better result. The presence of an overall theory or strategy for combining resources seems to be helpful, as was the case in the above example. But, with the aid of an appropriate strategy for tapping the potential of participants, bringing together a variety of resources appears to be a more powerful strategy for tackling the more difficult problems associated with INSET.

---

(60) Andersen and Olsen, op. cit., page 44. Full description of the project is on pages 43-45.

In certain contexts, the disadvantages of mixing resources may outweigh the advantages. However, it is very dangerous to assume that those who have traditionally provided the resources for a certain kind of INSET programme are necessarily those best equipped to do so. For instance, study days usually are handled by local school authorities, while long-term INSET efforts are handled by colleges and universities. One could easily argue that the opposite arrangement would be just as logical. Higher education can expose teachers to a wealth of new methods and ideas in a short period of time. On the other hand, there is evidence that long-term behavioural and attitude change need to be carried out in the context of the local school - organisational development work in a variety of contexts seems to point in this direction, including some such work done in schools themselves(61).

4.3.1 Problems in Mixing Resources

A policy of encouraging a mix of resources may run into three different kinds of problems. First, there are barriers to redeploying resources in an effort to test new theories. These barriers appear mainly to be institutional as well as contextual. Certain institutions in certain countries and regions appear more capable than others of calling on a variety of resources or of providing them. Teacher centres, for instance, have mobilised a variety of resources completely outside the educational establishment. Similarly, certain universities, for instance, in England, have been able to involve themselves in a large number of different activities.

It appears to me that those institutions which are most creative in resource utilisation are also the most autonomous, the least tied to centralised bureaucracies. A more autonomous institution is more easily able to enter into a contract to pool its resources with others. An INSET agency which is part of a centralised bureaucracy must go to ever higher levels to get approval for using the bureaucracy's resources in this way.

A comparison between federally funded and relatively autonomous education centres in Australia, versus teacher centres, which are part of State Education Departments, illustrates this difference. It also illustrates the countervailing advantage the less autonomous agents have: the capacity to draw on the resources of their parent bureaucracy. The federal Schools Commission specified that the education centres are free to apply to assistance from any quarter and to accept or reject offers of co-operation and requests for use of their facilities(62). Sources of finance of education centres include: federal funds, funds from regional development committees, fees for membership and for use of the facilities, and additional resources gleaned from working with various groups like groups for the handicapped, the local university, and local adult education programmes(63).

---

(61) See Mulford, op. cit.

Sources of finance for teachers' centres include: coverage of operating expenses by State Education Departments, grants from the State Development Committees, grants from regional development committees(64), and a source described as "working the system" to get cash for more urgent expenses, which would otherwise be held up by bureaucracy(65).

A second kind of problem involved in the non-traditional use of resources might be called "the hidden costs of resource mixing". Depending once again on national contexts and local conditions, the following kinds of problems may appear: funds from more diverse sources can be more easily mishandled. Extra time and effort may be spent knocking on doors in order to get different groups to contribute to INSET. This activity can even detract from examination of more fundamental problems. The English case study points out that the national advisory committee has lately spent most of its time talking about budget cuts and how to use surplus college resources(66). Hopefully, if the resources being mixed are contributions of time of various participants, some of these pitfalls can be avoided.

Yet even with human resources, a third kind of hidden cost can appear: governance problems. As more and more resources are brought in from diverse institutions, these institutions will want to make their varying points of view heard on policy problems: questions of objectives, evaluation, and so on. This input can be creative; however, if the initial partners to INSET are already in basic conflict, the entry of new institutions may make matters worse. The next section will discuss in more detail problems of conflict and collaboration in joint INSET planning.

4.4 Problems of Conflict and Collaboration in INSET Organisation and Planning

Collaboration between INSET agents is thus helpful in using resources more fully. Yet, as mentioned above, collaboration inevitably brings potential for conflict between those involved. The descriptions of the planning process in the country overviews in the Appendix illustrate this idea. How can INSET actors and advocates deal with the many conflicts arising from collaborative planning?

---

(62) B. Fallon and F. Fallon, op. cit.

(63) ibid., page 9.

(64) ibid., page 16.

(65) ibid., page 17.

(66) Bradley, op. cit., page 7.

4.4.1 Some General Remarks

One approach to the problem is to anticipate conflict by organising collaboration into an orderly series of steps. An OECD document suggests the following:

- define and classify INSET offerings versus needs together;
- review existing resources and/or create new INSET vehicles;
- agree on proper, distinctive role for each participant;
- agree on means for surveying INSET needs;
- co-ordinate INSET programming, disseminate programme information broadly, and agree on evaluation mechanism;
- renew cycle, based on evaluation(67).

These steps appear logical, yet if they can be followed, no basic conflicts exist. The problem is how to begin the process, or what to do when it breaks down.

A general guide for handling more serious conflicts is more difficult to formulate. Instead, different ways of dealing with different kinds of conflicts will be classified according to the nature of the INSET agents involved. In each case, I will define the problem as it appears in an international context, then discuss some of its implications, and finally give examples of solutions which have been found in certain national contexts or of national participants' recommendations. These solutions are not models to be copied out of context. They are given more as representative of certain policy directions which have been found useful in some countries, and thus perhaps also for others.

Other points of view on the subject are possible. Some individuals and groups connected with INSET may not only admit that collaboration can be difficult, but also question whether it is a good idea in the first place. As explained in the discussion of finance issues, bringing in more groups could make the problem of multiple objectives for INSET worse. Some have become wary of the best being lost in the inter-institutional shuffle. The study of English Teacher Centres fears

> "... a heavy layer or regional and local co-ordinative committees which, while preserving patterns of democratic representation, could multiply problems of communications and dialogue between individual innovative teachers or schools(68).

---

(67) OECD/CERI, Secretariat Note for the Salerno Conference, *La Coordination des Institutions responsables de la formation en cours de service des Enseignants*, Paris, 1978, pages 7-8.

(68) Griggs and Gregory, *op. cit.*, page 37.

Let us hope that collaborative enterprises in INSET will foster rather than drown innovation.

4.4.2 Relations between Central and Local Government Units

The important dilemma raised in the chapter on finance is central government financing and incentive seems necessary for adequate INSET, yet strong central control seem inimical to INSET's own need for local initiative and to citizen movements for more local control in many countries. As the English example shows, local authorities often cut INSET when economic pressure occurs. Central government proposals to change this pattern through strong controls has brought strong opposition(69).

The overview of planning in Australia shows how the system of earmarked grants created strong opposition there, as well. For the United States, many examples of resentment and negative side effects created by heavy-handed attempts of the federal government to control federally funded local programmes could be cited.

Is it possible for the central government to initiate, to fund, to encourage INSET, without creating great resentment by appearing to control and to reduce local powers at a time when many are asking for more local powers? Should we view any change as necessarily bringing resistance? If INSET becomes involved in an I win-you lose political power struggle between central and local government, this resistance is inevitable, and collaboration very difficult. Yet there are perhaps other ways of approaching the question. This international study has revealed the paradoxical necessity for central government funding and encouragement of INSET with as little central government control as possible. Those engaged in dialogue between central and local governments on INSET planning might want to take this point of view into account. A further step in the dialogue might be to ask: Is it possible to create national INSET structures which explicitly recognise this paradox?

Two rather different national examples seem to point in the direction of such structures. First, the structure of DLH appears to be a response to this paradox, as it is "centralised administration in connection with decentralised decision-making"(70). This structure is described in the country overview. Second, the Swedish case study suggests a somewhat different approach in the context of strong central government influence. It distinguishes between INSET which is school-based (school-determined), individual-based (individually determined), and based on central government decisions ("determined by the community"). According to decentralisation plans, school staff collectively and individually are to have direct influence over the first two kinds of INSET. For the third, initiative will remain with the central government, although local staff will influence implementation(71). This analysis, by the way, parallels the distinction between different INSET aims made in the OECD review of INSET evaluation studies.

---

(69) Bradley, op. cit., page 9.

(70) Andersen and Olsen, op. cit., page 19.

4.4.3 Relation of Universities and Teacher Training Colleges to INSET Activities

In different national contexts, we often find institutions of higher education either lamentably isolated from INSET or creating friction by their participation. In Sweden, the case study writer notes that the reorganisation of higher education has caused a break between initial teacher training and INSET and lessened contact between initial teacher trainers and state INSET consultants(72). The Australian case study writer comments that a similar break exists between planning and financing INSET in higher education and that activity elsewhere(73). On the other hand, in the United States, where higher education has been more involved in INSET, teacher reaction has not always been favourable. One observer notes that teachers often claim that the skilled practitioner is a better trainer than the theoretical college professor(74).

Tension can also arise between local authorities and universities over who should control INSET, as the example of the English regional planning controversy illustrates.

There is a parallel debate in higher education about who is better prepared for INSET, or who "has been doing it all along". Is it teacher training colleges, whose pre-service training has often included some sort of internship arrangement? Is it universities, who often cater to specialised needs of experienced teachers through longer courses?

In these debates, two kinds of distinction might be helpful. First, higher education can have either a "line" or "staff" function in teacher training. In many countries and situations, the function of higher education was more of a "line" function, being responsible for the production of trained teachers from beginning to end. With the advent of certain newer forms of INSET, the "staff" function of higher education personnel has become more important. Here university educators serve more as advisors to ongoing teachers and educational systems. Second, the role of higher education can vary according to whether INSET is concentrating on individual needs, systems needs, or "INSET determined by the community" with emphasis on social policy goals. For instance, in the latter kind of INSET, the line function of higher education may be more important, unless the social policy goal is process-oriented, such as "democratisation of the schools"(75).

---

(71) Henricson, op. cit., pages 43-44.

(72) Henricson, op. cit., page 15.

(73) Cameron, op. cit., page 36.

(74) Rubin, op. cit., page 10.

(75) An aim of the 1976 Swedish school reform law. Henricson, op. cit., page 34.

In looking for an example of a relatively "good fit" between institutions of higher education and INSET, one is somewhat limited to choosing those where the reactions of the different participants have been well documented. The Liverpool Pilot Induction Scheme seems to be such a relatively "good fit"; the way in which it solved certain of the problems mentioned above is instructive. Preplanning was done through a consortium approach, involving representatives of teachers, the local authority, colleges of education, and the university. The full gamut of resources was tapped, from experienced teachers to colleges and universities. College resources were organised into special professional centres. The "up front" emphasis of the plan was on using experienced teachers, both in teacher or professional centres and especially as teacher tutors(76). The teacher tutor role, seen by many as the key to the scheme's success, is essentially a staff role; many tutors even emphasized the "pastoral care" aspect of this role, rather than the training aspect, although this emphasis may be regarded as a weakness of the programme(77).

4.4.4 Relation of INSET and Research

In some contexts, the relationship between INSET and research seems to be a problem.

The Danish case study stresses the existence of two different approaches to INSET: an approach which stresses INSET (and education in general) as a tool of the political system and uses results-oriented research and development in teaching as a means to this end, versus an approach which stresses the self-renewing aspect of the educational system and uses INSET as a means to deeper further education of all concerned(78). Another aspect of the problem is the changing role of research in INSET. Traditionally, INSET is viewed as a means of spreading the results of educational research in school systems. More recently, the idea of establishing some sort of a dialogue between research and INSET or doing the two simultaneously, has gained ground. This new relation between research and INSET may put university researchers in more of a staff role than previously.

One example of this new relationship between research and INSET is the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research in the United States. According to the United States' case study, "Their philosophy involves utilising teachers as participants in research"(79).

---

(76) Moore, op. cit., page 77-83.

(77) R. Bolam, Innovation in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers, United Kingdom, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1976.

(78) Andersen and Olsen, op. cit., pages 6-7.

(79) Thurber, op. cit., page 12.

Action research INSET projects in a number of countries (United States, England, Denmark, Australia) could also be cited as examples of this new relationship between INSET and research. Section 43, above, gives one such example.

4.4.5 The Problematic Status of Regional INSET Bodies

The overviews of the planning process in England and in Australia illustrated the problems created by the emergence of new regional bodies charged with co-ordinating INSET. Regional bodies appear problematic, irrespective of whether their level is between the central and the local government level (England), between the state and the individual school level (Australia), or between the state and the local level(United States).

One way of viewing these conflicts is to note that, while INSET organisation generally calls for some regional organisation to allow a more efficient use of resources in a geographical area to which teachers have access, this new regional organisation upsets the delicate balance of powers between different levels of government surrounding it. It can also upset the status quo because participants in INSET would rather have the body be dominated by INSET agents, and not by the levels of government that surround it.

No one country in which this problem has arisen has managed to come up with a general solution. And any solution would doubtless have little generalisability, due to the importance of contextual factors in this kind of situation. At present, all the case studies have to offer are suggestions about the directions new solutions might take.

The English case study, in an attempt to diffuse discussions of control of INSET bodies at the regional level, gives a number of suggestions about how they might function. It notes that the first task of a regional committee would be to co-ordinate the planning of courses in the region so that overall needs were met.

The Committee should be involved in the early stages of its constituent agencies' course planning, so that it would not be put in the position of approving or disapproving existing projects. It should also try to sponsor activities involving resources from several agencies; to do this a common pool of funds could be established. The committee should set up structures which would allow individuals from different institutions with a common interest to meet together.

The case study favours flexible membership on such a committee with possibilities for co-opting expert opinion, rather than strict proportional representation of interests. It suggests that new regional bodies do more work on needs analysis, evaluation, and dissemination of information, or co-ordinating the latter. In conclusion, the study urges that the positive advantages of regional planning and policy be weighed against the possible threats to existing interest(80).

---

(80) Bradley, op. cit., pages 66-71

4.4.6 Teacher Participation in INSET Planning

The idea that teachers should participate in INSET planning has become a virtue to which just about all gave lip service. Yet conflict quickly arises over how different groups imagine that this participation should take place. For some, participation may mean more intensive individual dialogue within existing organisational structures, such as through individual teacher-supervisor conferences(81). For others, participation may mean the creation of new, teacher-run structures, similar to Australian Education Centres. For yet others, it may mean collective bargaining at the organisational level, as often happens in Sweden.

Among possible topics in this area, the role of unions is one which seems to generate great controversy. Should they participate in national planning, or local or regional planning? Do they represent what teachers really think? Are they ahead of or behind teachers in their thinking? One participant in the meeting of experts for INSET cost and resources, who had been involved in several surveys of teacher opinion, cautioned against jumping to conclusions about teacher opinion. In his experience, the response of teachers to INSET planning questions varied greatly according to the demographic and social characteristics of the teachers involved. On the primary school level in England, for instance, male teachers, more experienced and mobile, have very different INSET needs from female teachers, who are generally younger and less mobile in relation to INSET offerings. These clear divisions can make generalisations about "what teachers think" irrelevant. In addition, it is easy to see how teacher responses to politically charged questions, such as on unions, might vary, depending on who is asking the question.

Because it is generally recognised that adult learners must be consenting learners, participation of teachers in INSET planning has become a necessity. Yet one can distinguish three different ways of viewing teacher participation. It can be seen as an organisational device to insure better INSET programmes by finding out more about teacher needs and allowing teachers to feel they are being heard. The result is usually teacher participation in consultative bodies, such as Local Educational Authority advisory committees in England. Participation can be viewed as desirable for pedagogical reasons - the argument that teachers know best what is best for other teachers, cited above. This point of view is more frequent in English-speaking countries, and has resulted in wholly autonomous INSET activities run by teachers, such as the Australian Education Centres. Finally, participation can be viewed as desirable for ideological reasons - because one's conception of democratic society is one of democratic decision-making in education as well. This point of view is more frequent in the "Continental" countries surveyed here: Sweden, Denmark, and France. It is the point of view which admits most readily that unions have a definite part in INSET planning. It can also result in complex forms of representative decision-making, as at the DLH(82).

---

(81) For instance, the example in Thurber, op. cit., page 14, referred to in the section on motivation.

No generally relevant examples of solutions can be given, as the prevalence of these three points of view and the difficulties encountered in designing solutions around them varies greatly from one context to another. One example of a complex context variable is the relationship existing between the teacher and his immediate superior. At an OECD meeting, a union representative commented in this respect that:

> Effective collaboration will require coming to meetings with more than 'parity in numbers' between teachers and others involved with in-service for many teachers do not feel an individual sense of parity with individuals in the educational system(83).

4.4.7 A Few Conclusions on Collaborative Planning

At the beginning of this chapter we expressed the hope that solutions to problems in other areas could be found in the area of INSET planning. At this point, it may seem to the reader that problems in the area of planning itself are bigger than the problems planning was supposed to solve. Yet the complexities of the planning process should not overshadow some more hopeful trends. In all the countries studied (except perhaps for France, where we have incomplete information), there are conditions favouring collaborative planning in INSET, making a greater sharing of resources between INSET agents easier. Yet each country has its own peculiar pattern, full of strong points and also of gaps in collaborative organisation.

Despite the difficulties that various INSET agents encounter in planning and working together, there seems to be a continued wish for collaboration in INSET. Perhaps individuals involved in INSET are not discouraged easily because they feel they are trying to fill in a gap in the solitary profession of teaching. Many studies have, in fact, noted that opportunities and incentives for participation and collaboration are few in the teaching field. Some even speak of "anti-collaborative norms"(84).

---

(82) These three views parallel the three aims of INSET itself in the review of evaluation studies.

(83) K. Howey, International Workshop on Strategies for School-Focused In-Service Education and Training (INSET) West Palm Beach, Florida, United States, 6th-9th November, 1977, General Report and Conclusions, OECD, Paris, 1978, page 13.

(84) W.R. Mulford, op. cit.

Is there anything that can be done systematically to prepare INSET agents for collaborative work? The author of the OECD study on the training of trainers seems to think so. He notes that "... participative learning is slow, takes time, and involves skill development ..." and speaks of "Awareness of, and skill development in, group and organisation processes ..."(85 Naturally, skills that have proved useful in one context, training teachers or even trainers, may prove less so in another, planning meetings with members of different organisations in a sometimes politically charged atmosphere. Yet systematic skill development remains a possibility.

The numerous examples given in this chapter show that conflict in INSET planning is a fact of life which must be lived with. There may even be a common theme in several of these characteristic conflicts. Groups such as central government-local government or teachers-trainers-local authorities have traditionally stood in certain hierarchical relationships to one another. Recently, movements aimed at power equalisation have tended to challenge these relationships. Conflict under these circumstances is natural. In addition, the new economic climate of limited resources has tended to exacerbate tension between INSET agents. Given these rather strong forces leading in many contexts to conflict in INSET planning, the best that can be done is to try to deal with each conflict according to its specific characteristics, keeping in mind the various solutions mentioned in this section.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This report's review of the various factors associated with INSET cost and resource utilisation has revealed much uncertainty and disagreement and relatively few conclusions on which there is general agreement. Concerning costs, although many would like to see more exact inter- and intra-country comparisons, the data at hand do not permit this. There is a general scarcity of exact cost data, and, when it exists, it is not divided into standard cost categories, such as provision, teacher participation, and support services. International comparisons of unit costs run into complex methodological problems and, in fact, are not as useful as national comparisons for decision-making. A few would claim that national comparisons are not too useful either, as each programme should be judged on its educational merits. From the data available, key cost factors appear to be the cost of time teachers spend in INSET, often counted as release, the cost of travel and residency in situations where there is large geographic dispersion, and, in some programmes, the cost of using building and/or materials.

The finance topic has underlined the wide variety of opinions on the question of who should pay for teacher time in INSET. Contextual factors are very important, as is the question of whether to adopt systems needs versus individual

---

(85) *ibid.*

needs as a criteria. One can attempt to keep both needs in mind, giving systems needs priority in case of conflict. It is also important to keep in mind the effect of this kind of criteria on teacher motivations for attending INSET. A mix of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation seems optimal, but sources of motivation are often subtly related to contextual factors. Finally, the limits of local financing plead for central governments taking the initiative in this area, although this idea creates mistrust in some sectors, due to the connection between finance and control.

There is consensus that cost-effectiveness is an important topic, but also that it is particularly difficult in INSET because of the different kinds of objectives involved and the varied ways of measuring them. Decision-makers would generally favour investigating cost-effectiveness, while INSET specialists are usually wary of it. A possible compromise is to consider a given INSET objective as fixed and to try to look at different ways of reaching it in terms of cost.

Concerning the full utilisation of resources, there is a strong case for using a variety of resources from different INSET agents in non-traditional ways. Nevertheless, some countries and individuals are more disposed to this pattern than others. Admittedly, this pattern can create difficulties by complicating financial arrangements and by increasing problems of collaboration in the planning process. Some also challenge the educational advantages of this pattern as a general model for INSET, rather than as a tool for certain specific situations.

The topic of organisation and planning has shown that collaborative planning is an idea that is gaining ground in many countries, making resource mixing easier, but that it can create conflicts on many levels. Each of these conflicts must be dealt with in its national and institutional context.

Examples from some countries can provide a starting point for thinking about new solutions, for instance, concerning the delicate problem of central government finance and encouragement of INSET without central government control.

Considering the complications involved in dealing with the different topics connected with INSET cost and resource utilisation, it may be worthwhile to ask whether doing such things as determining the cost of an INSET programme is useful, or, if one wishes, "cost-effective". Case study writers for England and Denmark, for instance, have expressed skepticism on costing exercises. The former attempts to show that all INSET programmes have similar costs, while the latter seems to feel that the uncertainties involved in estimating key variables like cost of release nullify most comparisons. Establishing a common methodology may eliminate some of the uncertainty. Yet it is worth asking, in each specific instance, what purpose a local costing study is serving, and whether the effort expended is justified by the results the costing study will procure for the relevant decision-making process.

Underlying the latter topics, as with so many of the others, there seems to be a continuing tension between the two audiences mentioned in the introduction, the decision-makers and the INSET specialists. One could easily imagine a dialogue taking place between the two groups in a way which summarises many of the key issues of costs and resources. The decision makers want a clear answer to this question: how can we cut or control costs and organise INSET more efficiently? The answer which seems to emerge from the case studies is: If you want to manage costs better without decreasing outcomes substantially, then you must work to foster more consensus among actors in INSET on aims, roles, and outcomes. For example, in England, the stalemate over regional organisation is slowing efforts to better co-ordination and pooling of effort. Another example is the effort which has been made recently in Australia to co-ordinate the federally funded education centres and the state funded teacher centres, so as to prevent possible competition. However, the specialists are quick to add that they do not want consensus to mean uniformity, and that there must always be room for variation and innovation in a dynamic educational endeavour. In this respect, they look toward a better connection between INSET and R and D. Some decision-makers might reply: how can I ever get these warring factions in my area to come to consensus? The case studies and OECD INSET literature provide no easy solutions, but they do furnish examples of approaches that have worked better in certain situations and hints concerning approaches that might be tried.

It is interesting to note that the review of case studies in evaluation has come to similar conclusions; it stresses the need for continuing dialogue between INSET policy makers, INSET designers, and INSET evaluators, and it attempts to set up a framework for such a dialogue(86). The group equivalent to INSET evaluators would be INSET cost specialists or educational economists. Such a group has not yet appeared in connection with INSET cost or resource studies, undoubtedly because the techniques used until now have not yet reached the same level of sophistication as in evaluation.

It is usual for studies of this kind to end with a call for further research. Personally, I see an important part of the "further research" as a continuation of the dialogue between practitioners and decision-makers outlined above. And I fear that further research can easily become self-perpetuating. Yet the tentativeness of many of the conclusions does leave room for further work. Standard cost categories could be refined for national, local, and programme costs, with the help of specialists from different countries. In-depth cost studies of individual programmes could be made, using such a methodology. Costing could be incorporated into the initial design of the programme, along with evaluation, so that a better basis for cost-effectiveness could be established. In a general way, there is room for work with evaluation specialists toward better definitions of cost-effectiveness, as references to the review of OECD evaluation case studies have suggested.

---

(86) Fox, op. cit.

Other problems encountered in this study suggest research of a more behavioural science variety. Local groups could experiment with the use of the resource utilisation table. Cases of successful negotiation of financing of teacher time in INSET could be studied, i.e. those in which all parties seem relatively satisfied. As one case study writer has suggested, INSET programmes involving collaboration could be studied systematically to see how they work, whether they encourage or discourage innovation, and how they establish data necessary for decisions (and, I might add, how they manage conflict).

Several case study writers have also called for continued international dialogue in this and related areas. Apparently, despite contextual barriers to direct comparison and transfer, INSET specialists and decision-makers can still benefit from insights gained by viewing work in cost and resource utilisation in other countries(87). Further international work could monitor case studies in areas of further research, especially cost effectiveness. However, before such work could begin, it would be helpful to reach greater agreement on cost categories and to resolve some of the issues of INSET purpose raised in the review of evaluation studies.

---

(87) One writer suggests international costing studies of different approaches to certain key kinds of INSET needs.

PENDIX I - RESOURCE UTILISATION TABLE

(See section 4.2 of text for explanation)

Resources (agents who provide, organise, fund, or host = P,O,F, or H)

Type of Programme/ Country		Central Government and its Staff	Regional Unit(1)	University	Teacher Training College	Teacher Centre	Broadcasting Authority	Subject or Professional Association	Local School Authority	Individual School	Individual Teacher
SHORT COURSES (up to 20 hours) including study days	ENGLAND	1. P,O and F conferences for trainers, LEA officers, etc. 2. HMI P. staff for others' courses	Sometimes discusses needs and possibilities	P,O,F,H, P. individual staff. Can use university funds, collect tuition, fund courses in colleges and teacher centres	P,O,H,P indiv. staff In past, usually funded by LEA, univ., or DES, Will F in future with 20% commitment to INSET	1. P,O,F,H particularly very short activities. 2. H to other courses: ex. LEA advisers	P,O,F TV and radio programmes or series	P,O subject associations have very limited funds	P,O,F,H 1.F teacher centres 2.P or O own activ. 3.F teacher expenses or release 4.Advisers P staff to others.	O,H: 1. study days 2. Department and other working groups.	F 1. often pays cost himself for shares with LEA 2. gives time.
	AUSTRALIA	Federal Government F through earmarked grants to state Development Committees	State Development Committees F selected activities submitted by potential organisers State also P,O,H.	Help O,P staff (rarely H courses usually funded by State Development Committees	Help O (rarely), P Staff, H courses usually funded by State Development Committees; F	O,H many, F some federally funded centres are autonomous - most are state controlled.	Very little - but local radio and TV used as medium for some courses	P many courses some funded by State Development Committees, Also O,F,H	Regional Development Committees use federal/state funds for short courses, school-based, Teacher Centre Activities. Also PO,H	Hold staff conferences - apply to Regional Development Committees for funds.	Can O - any teacher may apply to Regional or State Development Committees for funds.
	UNITED STATES	May be available through special funded programmes (example: Title I)	P	Can P for local school districts	Can P for local school districts	Can P - of most frequent delivery systems	Can P - both public and commercial stations	Can P - one of most frequent delivery systems	P	Can P, especially in areas where school-focused INSET used	Usually through LEA.
	DENMARK	F gymnasium level	F			P,O,H		P,O gymnasium level		H	
	SWEDEN	F	P,O,F	-			P,O as part of other INSET activities	P,O, F	P,O,F	O	
MEDIUM LENGTH COURSES (20 to 100 hours)	ENGLAND	1. P,O,F: HMI organised courses 2. F DES/Regional courses (with ATO/DES). 3. P indiv. staff to other.	Discusses DES/Regional courses	1. P,O,F,H see short courses. 2. P and O DES/Regional Courses. 3. P. indiv. staff to other.	1. P,O,H (F in future) see short courses 2. H for DES and university courses 3. P indiv. staff to other.	P,O,F,H but infrequently	-	P,O but infrequently	1.P,O,F through advisers 2.F: teachers Cen. 3.F teachers' fees, expenses replacements 4.O jointly DES/Regional courses	-	F 1. often pays himself or with LEA 2. gives time
	AUSTRALI	Federal government F through earmarked grants to State Development Committees	F - see short courses Can F and P Example: training new participants, also O, H	P,O,F (rarely) H courses funded by State Development Committees	P,O,F (rarely) H courses funded by State Development Committees.	Rarely provide; O,F,H	H	(Rarely) P,O,F,H	(Rarely) P,O,H	H(?)	O(?)
	UNITED STATES	May be available through special funded programmes (example: Title I)	P	Can P for local school districts	Can P for local school districts	Can P with LEA or university assistance	Can P Both public and commercial stations	Can P, particularly for administrators	P	Can P, especially in areas where school-focused INSET used	Frequently through LEA
	DENMARK			DLH: P,O,F,H			P,O,F periodical and in co-operation with DLH		F(release)	H (school-based)	
	SWEDEN	P,O,F	P,O,F	P,O				P,O,F	F (partially)		
LONG COURSES (over 100 hours)	ENGLAND	1. F universities 2. F - supplements LEA funds for release	Advises DES on logistics of long course provision	1. P,O,F major provider. 2. Ex ATOs still fulfil the regional function. 3. Validate for oth.	P,O,F,H	-	"H" BBC works with Open University	Not usually P,O,F,H but occasionally an association validates an award (ex: Math. Assoc.)	F teachers' fees, expenses and replacements	A few examples of school-based courses for its own staff, run by others, ex: Universities	1. sometimes pays his own fees 2. usually meets some expenses himself. 3. gives time.
	AUSTRALIA	Federal Government sponsors particular courses (Special Educ. Librarian training, migrant education) State Development Committees co-ordinate.	State employers sponsor courses, F release; State O,H	P qualifications, mostly for general degrees (M.Ed.) some specialist courses; O,F,H	P main provider of specialist courses for diplomas, B. Eds; O,F,H	No	No	No	P(?)	No	No
	UNITED STATES	P a few programmes	District consortiums can P	Yes, usually responsibility of individual teachers	Yes, usually responsibility of individual teachers	Can P (though usually shorter courses)	Commercial stations most frequent H Public TV also H	Not usually, or very few individual internships (ex: AASA)	usually done in consort with other agencies or universities	not usually	usually at own expense
	DENMARK			DLH: P,O,F,H regular and graduate study programmes	Practising teachers can apply for courses if classes not fully occupied by students				F (release) for both regular and graduate study programmes.	H (school-based)	
	SWEDEN	P,O,F	P,O,F	P,O,F - regular university courses part of sabbatical year system					F(partially)		
TUTORIAL ADVISING, OR CONSULTING WORK	ENGLAND	1.P, HMI feedback after school inspection. 2.Informal advice from HMI. Not funded specifically	-	1.P,O usually informally, sometimes advertised usually response to request. 2.Action Research 3.Curriculum Develop.	1.Small in past; in future, will F through 20% for INSET. 2.Curriculum Development	1.O,H occasionally using expertise from Univ., College or LEA adviser 2.Curriculum Dev.	-	-	1.POF: part of job of LEA adviser, either in school or Teacher Centre 2.POF curriculum development	1.Seek advice from outside experts 2.Working groups of staff. 3.Prof. tutors(rare) 4.POH curriculum development 5.H action research	informal guidance and consultation between staff
	AUSTRALIA	F only indirectly	Main responsibility of state education employers: P,O,F,H	No - except on an informal invited basis	No - except on an informal invited basis: P rarely	P: Some advisers based here	No	No	Teacher consultants in specialised subject areas (ex: Art) based in regions; P,O,H	H only	No
	UNITED STATES	Some technical assistance available	P	usually available	usually available	possible - most desired and popular use	usually not used in this way	Can P one of the most usual types of assistance	P	Can P	usually available through school or LEA
	DENMARK	P,O,F				H			H; POF (—— gymnasium level(?) ——)	H	
	SWEDEN	P,O,F	P,O,F	-					POF		

1. The Regional Unit in Denmark is the county; in the United States it is either the state or the multi-district consortium; in Australia, it is the state. The sub-state region in Australia corresponds to a local level, as is indicated in this table, so the activities of the Regional Development Committees are listed under "Local School Authority".

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX II

Country Overviews:
Cost Tables, Finance and Planning

2.1 England and Wales

TABLE 1: National cost of INSET 1973-74 in England and Wales

Type of cost	DES	All LEAs	Universities	Open(3) University	Total	
Cost of trainers	£0.5m		£3.6m	£1.5m	5.6	20%
Materials and services		£5.5m	£1.3m	£1.7m	8.5	29%
Travelling expenses	-		-	-	-	-
Teacher assistance	-		-	-	-	-
Central Office Personnel used	(?)1	(?)2	£0.4m	£0.8m	1.2	4%
Payment of substitute Teachers	-	£8.8m	-	-	8.8	30%
Maintenance of premises	-	£3.5m(4)	£1.0m	£0.5m	5.0	17%
Total	£0.5m	£17.8m	£6.3m	£4.5m	29.1	100

(1) Cost of HMI's salaries was £10m, but the proportional of this attributable to INSET is not known.

(2) Proportion of advisers' and administrators' salaries devoted to INSET unknown.

(3) Total figures divided by 3 as about one third of Open University students are teachers.

(4) Teacher Centres.

Explanation of abbreviations:

DES: Department of Education and Science, the central government agency

LEA: Local Educational Authorities

HMI: Her Majesty's Inspectors

Source: H.W. Bradley, In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications - II The British Example, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

TABLE 2

Budgets of Two English LEAs for INSET in 1976-77

Table 2a: Lincolnshire INSET budget, 1976-77
Lincolnshire is a rural county covering a large area with about 5200 teachers

	£	Lincolnshire %
1. Courses		
(a) Spent at advisers' discretion (course provision and support)	10471	
(b) Spent by area officers (support of teachers)	9614	
(c) Spent by teacher centres (course provision and support)	5180	
Total	25265	10%
2. Secondment		
(a) Salaries (full figure 75% recouped from pool)	110515	
(b) Expenses (poolable and non-poolable)	4410	
Total	114925	46%
3. Teacher Centres		
(a) Salaries and wages	55400	
(b) Premises	35420	
(c) Materials, etc.	18630	
Total	109450	44%
GRAND TOTAL	249640	100%

Table 2b: Derbyshire INSET budget, 1976-77
Derbyshire contains both urban and rural areas.
It has some 7800 teachers.

		£	Derbyshire %
1.	Courses for Teachers	27770(*)	9%
2.	Secondment	193600	57%
3.	Teacher Centres	86660	25%
4.	Curriculum Experimental Funds	29400(*)	9%
	Total	337430(*)	100%

(*) Items 1 and 4 were increased during the year by a total of £2830, making a revised total of £340260.

Source: op. cit., Table 1.

For national summary of LEA expenditures, see Table C in text.

TABLE 3

Cost per New Teacher of Liverpool Teacher Centre Course in Pilot Induction Scheme (England)

	First Year(1)	Second Year(2)
Teaching Staff Salaries	£ 43.65	£ 90.20
Administrative Salaries	£ 7.50	£ 19.00
Lecture Fees	£ 3.40	£ 14.20
Materials	£ 25.00	£ 30.00
Travel Costs of Staff	£ 1.85	£ 11.80
Travel Costs of New Teachers	£ 11.90	£ 9.60
Overheads - proportion of building maintenance, etc.	£ 13.80	£ 38.30
	£107.10	£213.10

(1) Included 120 new teachers attending for more than twenty days and individual tuition throughout the year.

(2) Included sixty new teachers attending for fourteen days plus tuition fees.

Source: W.L. Moore, "An LEA Case Study - Liverpool" in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Cost and Financing Implications - II The British Example, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

TABLE 4

a) Budget of Lincolnshire Teacher Centres, 1976-77 (England)

Wardens' salaries; secretarial and cleaning help	£ 55 400
Rent, rates, fuel, and maintenance of premises	35 400
Materials, stationery, and other expenses	18 650
Course provision and teachers' travelling expenses	5 180
Total	£114 630

Source: op. cit., Table 1

b) 1975-76 Expenditures on Teacher Centre in Elsinore, England

Employees' salaries	£ 17 050
Supplies and services (stationery, books, apparatus)	3 000
Administrative expenses	500
Equipment	850
Lecturers fees	3 500
Cost of premises, maintenance, redecoration, and other	11 541
Total	£ 36 441

Source: A. Griggs and J. Gregory, Teacher Centres in the United Kingdom in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Towards School-Focused Training - V Teacher Centres in Australia and the United Kingdom, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

TABLE 5

Liverpool Micro-Teaching Course (England)

£800 for one set of materials and development of the technique to be employed

Salary cost of attendance per teacher	£65	- for 5 sessions
Salary cost of course consultant teacher	£20	- assuming groups of 3 or 4 at one session.
Materials cost per teacher	£ 5	
	£90	

Source: *op. cit.*, Table 3

For cost of hypothetical 40 hours course, see Table E in text.

TABLE 6

Cost of Liverpool Induction Scheme, Second Year (England)

	£	% of total cost
Salaries of replacement for New Teachers	1000 pa	64%
Salaries of replacement Teacher/Tutors	200	13%
Professional Centre Costs (including travel)	310	20%
Central Administration	50	3%
	£1560	

Source: op. cit., Table 3.

TABLE 7

Cost of Full-Time University Course in England, 1976 (estimate)

Secondment (replacement)	£ 4 500
Tuition	1 900
Travel	40
Total	£ 6 440

Source: op. cit., Table 1

Patterns of INSET Finance in England and Wales

In England and Wales, the national government has been active in funding regional courses, its own shorter courses, and especially in funding national pilot induction schemes(88). Certain teacher centres also originated with national curriculum projects(89). The national government supports INSET indirectly through the rate support grant system. This system is the means by which the central government distributes funds to local government, to supplement local taxes and to pay for other services as well as education. The central government assigns national priorities for each service, but local governments are not obliged to follow them. National estimates include money for INSET, but local authorities often use it for other purposes, as local budgeting techniques have led to overall reductions in educational spending. Under these conditions, direct costs of educational services come first, and INSET is sacrificed(90).

Centralised funding of higher education for INSET also combines central equalisation with maximum local choice. The teacher training pool is a national system whereby funds from local authorities for teacher training are redistributed according to the various authorities' ability to pay, school population, and their investment in longer term INSET (teachers being replaced, institutions being supported). Some claim the system is cumbersome and lacks accountability.

Yet, as Table 14 shows, the major source of INSET funds is local finance, especially for replacement. Universities, both traditional and "open", also provide a large part of INSET finance. Other sources seem of little importance, aside from contributions of teacher time.

Patterns of Organisation and Planning in England and Wales

The organisation and planning of INSET in England and Wales includes the following: generally strong local initiative, many autonomous agents, increasing central influence, and attempts to co-ordinate all these. Nationally, the tradition of committee reports has become institutionalised with an advisory subcommittee on induction and INSET, including representatives of most INSET groups. Although its suggestions to the central government have not always been heeded, due to severe financial problems, national policy papers have inspired local emulation, and the central government can provide indirect incentives and pressures for such programmes as induction and teacher centres.

---

(88) Bradley, op. cit., pages 33 and 49.

(89) Griggs and Gregory, op. cit., page 3.

(90) Bradley, op. cit., page 8.

At the regional and local level, INSET agents are generally autonomous. Those running award-bearing courses plan with only a minimum of consultation with school districts or teachers, and are restricted only by accreditation and funding of teacher replacement. University-based Area Training Organisations (ATOs) have allowed more co-ordination between INSET agents concerning short courses and some joint ventures. Local school advisers, teacher centres and teacher associations also have much autonomy(91).

There is a gradual movement toward collaboration on the local and regional level, including informal contacts between agents and continued work with the ATOs. Officially, the latter organisations are supposed to be discontinued, and they are to be replaced by overall regional INSET co-ordinating bodies, designed to meet the financial and planning impetus for general regional co-ordination. The decision is blocked by the following controversy: The LEAs want the regional body to be a part of a larger further education regional unit in which LEAs would have a large say, while some teacher and university groups favour a regional body dealing exclusively with INSET and giving more say to colleges and universities. The relationship of this new body with national policy, with autonomous local agents, and with the national controversy over devolution of powers locally is not clear, either. Meanwhile, Area Training Organisations and local institutions consulting committees continue to assure some harmony(92).

The same wide variety of agents involved in programme planning also are those that actually carry out INSET programmes. This can result in a good number of jointly run courses, as the Resource Utilisation Table suggests. It can also result in situations where several agents are competing for a similar clientele.

The feedback or evaluation part of this complex planning process goes on at a number of different levels. It often relies on "informed professional opinion" of those responsible, such as LEA advisers, Her Majesty's Inspectors, or Teacher Centre Wardens. This opinion can be either informal or part of a formal inquiry process. In a system which allows for much free choice, teacher enrolments is also a form of feedback, as is the opinion of various agents channelled in co-ordinating bodies.

---

(91) ibid., page 62

(92) ibid., pages 63-66.

2.2 Australia

TABLE 8

Estimated Expenditure on INSET (Australia 1976)

	Type of INSET Activities and Services	Types of Costs	Estimated Expenditure 1976
I.	Training and specialist training	Course costs	$35m
		Salary costs for teachers on study leave	$25m
II.	Advisory/consultant services	Salaries and allowances	$16.6m
III.	School-based teacher advisory services	Salaries	?
IV.	Development activities	Replacement	$18m
		State Devel. C'tee/ gov/non-Gov programmes/ educn/teacher centre programmes	$14m
			$108.6m +

Source: P. Cameron "The Australian Experience" in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications - I The Australian and United States Examples - OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

For cost of Australian Education Centres, see Table D in text.

TABLE 9

Average Cost of Australian State Development Activities

Travel costs	$19,520
Daily living allowance	37,097
Replacement costs	24,518
Administration costs	6,061
	$87,196

Average cost per participant = $937
Average length of visit = 16.6 days
Average cost per day = $57.05

Source: op. cit., Table 8.

TABLE 10

Cost of Operating a Residential Centre for In-Service Education in Australia (1976)

Type of Costs	Annual Cost	Percentage of Total Cost
	$	%
A. Cost of resources used for more than one year		
1. Buildings and equipment (yearly cost)	39,700	22.5
B. Current costs		
1. Professional staff salaries and benefits	24,600	14.0
2. Clerical and staff salaries and benefits	14,700	8.3
3. Domestic and maintenance staff salaries and benefits	68,250	38.6
4. Building maintenance and overhead costs	10,600	6.0
5. Resource material costs	2,800	1.8
6. Office and administration costs	2,200	1.2
7. Travel	550	0.3
8. Food	13,200	7.5
	$176,600	

Source: *op. cit.*, Table 8.

The above table excludes costs of courses, as well as travel to the centre. Daily per participant cost is $33.75 (*ibid.*, page 19). This might be compared to daily cost of replacement in Australia of $50.

Patterns of INSET Finance in Australia

The Federal Schools Commission's funding for INSET programmes, beginning in 1974, has allowed for "a massive boost to the funding of INSET throughout the country"(93). This funding includes the establishment of thirty-two education centres by 1975(94). Funds for INSET generally come as categorical allocations, rather than block grants. This complex system includes grants from the Commission on Advanced Education and the Universities Commission to colleges and universities, and Schools Commission grants for teacher development, general recurrent and capital grants, and special project programmes, directed at both state and non-government schools. However, the Australian system also includes block grants from the federal to state government. These grants constitute the major source of state revenue for education(95). Block grants are also provided to colleges and universities. Funding rules generally limit university courses to those part of a formal degree programme(96).

Yet the states provide a major portion of direct funding for INSET, as Table 8 shows. They also provide replacement costs for higher education training and specialist training. Thus, Commonwealth grants are seen as a supplement(97). In Australia, as elsewhere, teachers contribute to INSET financing by giving of their free time for course attendance, staffing, and planning. The Australian case study notes that about half the short courses and workshops are held on teacher time, but in some states this figure can be as high as 80 per cent. Yet most long courses are held during school hours, so that on the average 30-35 per cent of in-service days were on teacher time(98).

The Australian teachers' subject associations draw on funds from a variety of sources, including membership fees and contributions from businesses, for INSET courses. Yet overall, less than 0.5 per cent of INSET development funds are from private sources(99).

Patterns of Organisation and Planning in Australia

The general pattern of INSET planning and organisation in Australia is twofold. First, central government policy and programmes have aimed at getting the states to do more, at broader based representation in INSET planning, and at stimulating more local initiative. Second, long-term INSET courses at colleges and universities have continued and expanded as a separate activity, with some notable exceptions.

---

(93) Cameron, op. cit., page 2

(94) Fallon and Fallon, op. cit., page 2.

(95) Educational Financing and Policy Goals for Primary Schools, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1979.

(96) Cameron, op. cit., pages 8-10 and 31-32.

(97) ibid., page 36.

(98) ibid., page 21.

(99) ibid., page 15.

Central government policy planning in pursuit of the above-mentioned aims includes, by law, consultation with the interested parties(100). These consultations, including national conferences of federal and state administrators, have helped to smooth certain tensions created by these new aims. These tensions include objections to the fact that Commonwealth intervention can support INSET programmes contrary to state priorities, and objections to participant involvement in administration of Commonwealth grants as "threatening traditional patterns of power and influence ..."(101).

Schools Commission policy has mandated the creation of State and Regional (i.e. more local) Development Committees. These committees have representatives of parents, teachers, non-government schools, state education officials, and sometimes of other groups. They have a co-ordinating role, and can award grants for courses. However, their decision-making responsibility can be limited by state regulations about who controls funds(102).

Local pressure and central government incentives have attempted to allow more local autonomy in the basically centralised state planning pattern. For example, the Schools Commission has sponsored the education centres, which are legally autonomous bodies, run by teachers and certain community representatives. The centres can also receive state funding(103). Another example is courses run by individual teachers or groups of teachers(104). However, as far as execution goes, most courses are actually carried out by State Department of Education personnel aside from award-bearing courses. This includes personnel in local schools and State-sponsored teacher centres.

For colleges and universities, policy planning is made in the national commissions mentioned in the finance section, thus separated from Schools Commission INSET planning. In addition, in the past, many tertiary institutions have not attempted to develop special courses for general INSET needs because of the strong demand for initial training(105). This situation, plus restrictions on non-accredited courses, means little INSET planning goes on. Yet, as far as execution goes, in 1976, about one fifth of those enrolled in teacher education courses in colleges of advanced education were qualified teachers(106), and colleges and universities participate in certain specialised activities.

---

(100) M. Skilbeck and G. Evans, Innovation in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers, Australia, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1976.

(101) Cameron, *op. cit.*, pages 35-36.

(102) *ibid.*, pages 37, 39-40.

(103) *ibid.*, pages 46-47.

(104) *ibid.*, page 37.

(105) *ibid.*, page 32.

(106) *ibid.*, page 10.

As a result of this situation, the Australian case study calls for stronger links between tertiary institutions and INSET planning agencies on both the state and federal levels(107).

In the area of feedback and evaluation, aside from formal and informal arrangements for individual programmes and from feedback resulting from participant involvement, systematic evaluation has occurred more through general overall evaluations of the Schools Commission programmes. However, on the state level, two different studies report a lack of systematic evaluation, due perhaps to an emphasis on getting programmes started quickly(108).

---

(107) ibid., pages 31, 36.

(108) ibid., pages 33-34, and Skilbeck and Evans, op. cit.

2.3 United States

TABLE 11

Federal Government Expenditures on Professional Development of Educational Personnel in the United States in Fiscal Year 1978

1.	Estimated proportions of various programmes:		
	Teacher Corps	$ 37,500,000	
	Bureau of Educationally Handicapped	43,375,000	
	Teacher Centres	8,250,000	
	Vocational Educational Professional Development	3,500,000	
	Bilingual Education Training Programmes	37,000,000	
	Emergency School Assistance Act (aid to desegregation) ...	56,000,000	
	Title IV Civil Rights Act	12,000,000	
	Drug and Alcohol Abuse Education	1,800,000	
	Seven other programmes	14,800,000	
	Total of expenditures on four following programmes: Career Education Severely Handicapped Indian Education Follow-Through (aid to disadvantaged students in primary schools)	6,100,000	
	Total of expenditures on various programmes listed above	$ 220,325,000	
	Total rounded off, due to estimates involved		$ 220,000,000
2.	Estimated proportion of ESEA Title I funds (aid to students from low socio-economic situations) used for professional development of educational personnel		280,000,000
3.	Grand Total		$ 500,000,000

Source: J.C. Thurber, "The United States Example" in *In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications - I The Australian and United States examples* - OECD/CERI, Paris, 1979.

TABLE 12

Sample of Local Educational Agency Expenditures on INSET in Florida (United States)

9a. Baker County Projected Expenditures on INSET, 1978-79 (small rural district)

Salaries for conducting or co-ordinating INSET	27%
Substitutes	2%
Travel to INSET activities	45%
Other expenses	26%
Total	100% ($13,500)

9b. Hillsboro County Projected Expenditures on INSET, 1978-79 (large school system on coast)

Instructor costs	8%
Substitutes and stipends for participants	65%
Instructional Materials	17%
Travel to INSET programmes and institutes	10%
Total	100% ($446,434)

9c. Estimated Expenditures of a "Typical Florida County"

Salaries for co-ordination and instructors	36%
Purchased services of outside consultants	20%
Instructional materials	17%
Other expenses including travel and registration for INSET activities	26%
Total	100%

Source: op. cit., Table 11.

TABLE 13

Cost of Hillsboro, New Hampshire Two Year Leadership Academy Programme (United States)

Substitute teachers	$ 800
Instructors	500
Materials	500
Total	$1,800

Note: Release time provided only during the first of two years; the second year is devoted to independent projects in home schools.

Source: op. cit., Table 11.

Patterns of INSET Finance in the United States

Federal funding of staff development activities increased in the United States about ten times between 1972-73 and fiscal year 1978(109). Included in this increase is direct federal funding of teacher centres, beginning in 1977. Federal block grants to states and localities, or revenue sharing funds, "have made virtually no impact on INSET programmes across the nation"(110). A variety of categorical and block grants from federal and state government support INSET in institutions of higher education. In some states, at least, the focus has moved from supporting these institutions to supporting INSET programmes at the district level, such as teacher centres(111).

State funds for local district INSET come from both block and categorical grants. The United States case study gives the example of Florida, where special categorical state funds are used to finance local districts' INSET activities. At the same time, each local district in Florida submits a comprehensive master plan for INSET and reports resource utilisation, including allocation and expenditure(112). It is difficult to determine whether, in general, state and local funding is larger than federal funding. The United States case study notes the great diversity of level and kind of support for INSET among states and local districts. This can go from almost nothing to a judicious mixture of state, local, and federal funds, including tuition for further degree programmes(113). The degree of financial participation of colleges and universities is also very varied.

Funds from philanthropic foundations can be an additional source of INSET finance, as the case study of teacher centres shows(114).

Patterns of Organisation and Planning in the United States

INSET planning in the United States is highly decentralised and goes on at several different levels. In some cases, these separate efforts have been drawn together in systematic co-ordination and planning or in exemplary consortium efforts.

On the national level, the associations of various INSET agents attempt to influence the federal legislature and the executive. A few bodies allow for dialogue between these groups, such as the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development. However, no federal office appeals to co-ordinate INSET planning for all federal programmes.

---

(109) Thurber, op. cit., pages 21 and 23.

(110) ibid., page 19.

(111) ibid., page 25.

(112) ibid., pages 24-25 and 28-29.

(113) ibid., pages 11, 18.

(114) K. Devaney, "Teacher Centres in the United States" in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Towards School-Focused Training - IV The United States Experience - OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978, p. 4.

State INSET planning is as varied as state educational organisation generally. Yet many states did not have until recently central co-ordinating bodies capable of setting INSET policy(115). A few states, such as Florida, have made INSET a priority, but, in the latter case, only the broadest guidelines are given on the state level. Most planning goes on at the local level, as Florida officials feel that local schools and staff are in the best position to assess needs and develop programmes(116).

Most planning thus goes on at the local level, as does execution of activities, including federally funded ones. This planning can be very simple, or very complex, as in the example given in the case study of Palm Beach, Florida. Programmes are planned by the faculty and principal of each school and reviewed by various levels of district organisation. The school staff, aided by the area superintendents, implements the plan. Evaluation is done by the staff, sometimes by an external agent, and, in a general review process, by the Department of Professional Staff Development(117). This particular school district emphasizes school-focused INSET.

Consortium efforts between institutions of higher education and/or teacher centres and local school districts are another form of local planning. Representatives of teachers, of the community, and of state departments of education can also participate in the effort. Several OECD publications describe such consortia(118).

For a description of evaluation in the United States, see the OECD United States case study on evaluation and the general report.

---

(115) Rubin, op. cit., pages 26-27.

(116) Thurber, op. cit., pages 24-26.

(117) ibid., pages 33-34.

(118) Howey, op. cit., page 133 and OECD/CERI Secretariat's Note for the Salerno Conference, op. cit., pages 6-7.

2.4 Denmark

TABLE 14

The Budget for DLH in 1977-78(1)

Salary for lecturers	60,600,000 kr(2)
Replacement of teachers	?(3)
Travel	1,600,000
Administration	2,400,000
Services	1,400,000
Equipment and materials	5,600,000
Building and technical facilities	2,500,000
Total	74,100,000 kr.

Source: H. Andersen and T.P. Olsen: "The Danish Example" in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications - III The Danish and Swedish Examples - OECD/CERI, Paris 1979.

Notes

1. DLH: The Royal Danish School of Educational Studies.
2. This figure includes salaries given to full-time staff members to spend 40 per cent of their time on research; these salaries for research work represent about 9,000,000 kr. (Source: authors' note concerning above study).
3. No exact figures are given for total cost of teacher replacement. Payment of substitutes for full-time teachers alone cost about 21.4 million Danish kroner (Source: Andersen and Olsen, *op. cit.*, page 8). Most DLH students are part-time.

TABLE 15

Cost of Typical DLH Course, Denmark (Physics for the youngest class levels)(1)

Trainers' salaries	32,700 kroner
Materials	1,500
Release of course participants	126,000
Total	160,200

Source: op. cit., Table 14

Note: Course costs do not include laboratories, workshops, special materials, etc. Release costs were calculated with 2/3 of course time being paid for. If all of course time were paid for, release would cost 189,000 kroners.

TABLE 16

Cost of DLH Multi-Media Course, 1977 (Denmark)

Production expenditures:

I.	The media:		
	a) 1 T.V. hour at 175,000 kr.	175,000	
	b) 4 radio hours at 30,000 kr. each	120,000	295,000
II.	The course book:		
	a) 300 hours of work with extrenal authors at 90 kr.	27,000	
	b) 120 hours of work with internal authors at 90 kr.	10,800	
III.	Project leadership 850 hours at 90 kr.	76,500	
	Project group 730 hours at 90 kr.	65,700	
	External colleagues 125 hours at 90 kr.	11,250	191,250
	Production costs		486,250

Operational expenditure

Consultants:	15 hours of work times 300 study circles 4,500 working hours at 90 kr.	405,000
Course book:	5,000 participants at 25 kr.	125,000
		530,000

Production costs	486,250
Operational expenditures	530,000
	kr. 1,016,250

The costs per participant = kr. 203,25

Source: *op. cit.*, Table 14.

Note: If time teachers spend in study cirlces (15 hours) is counted as a cost, 6,750,000 kroners must be added. If total average participation time of 30 hours is counted, this figure must be doubled.

TABLE 17

Cost of DLH Special Education Course (Denmark)

Number of participants: 34 with substitutes	3,400,000 kr.
Expenses	
Salaries	
a. Course leader, full-time	125,000
b. Clerk, full-time	90,000
c. Permanent lecturers)	2,700,000
d. Part-time lecturers)	
Expenses per student (excluded materials and examinations):	185,735 kr
Total	6,500,735 kr

Source: *op. cit.*, Table 14.

Patterns of INSET Finance in Denmark

Despite the fact that education in Denmark is basically decentralised, the financing of INSET is mainly the responsibility of the central government. The central government's main financial contribution is through its funding of DLH (INSET for grades 1-10 teachers) as well as for a limited number of teachers of certain other levels and other institutions, such as teacher training colleges(119). The central government also funds the State Institute for Vocational Teacher Training, INSET for gymnasium teachers (grades 10-12) run in co-operation with the unions, the Institute for Studies in Higher Education, and courses for teachers in adult education(120).

However, the contribution of local authorities to INSET in Denmark is not negligible; it may even be greater than central government financing. First, local authorities pay the cost of release for teachers on part- or full-time study leave for courses at DLH. Second, every school and its staff has four study days a year. As mentioned in the chapter on costs, the cost of these days may be greater than the total DLH budget.

Patterns of Organisation and Planning in Denmark

Most INSET planning in Denmark includes aspects of both centralisation and decentralisation, with a strong accent on participation. Planning in DLH is highly participatory, as is often the case in universities. Yet because DLH is national in scope, this participation is applied nation-wide and includes national policy planning for the compulsory school level. Teachers, students, and technical-administrative staff are represented in a ratio of 2:1:1 on DLH's governing boards: the central Konsistorium, the councils of DLH's specialised institutes, and the branch-councils of the eight branch institutes. The Konsistorium elects DLH's rector. Representation on the various study boards, responsible mainly for curriculum planning, is one half teachers and one half students. Finally, central and branch advisory councils include representatives from teachers unions, local districts, teacher training colleges, and so on(121).

Centralisation and participatory decision-making are also present in the course catalogue and admissions process. First, the advisory councils and study boards make up course propositions. Next, the Central Study Board makes general guidelines for the curriculum, in keeping with national and school needs. The different study boards use these guidelines to make the formal curriculum, which is then reviewed by the Central Study Board and, in a general way, by the Konsistorium, before being published.

---

(119) Andersen and Olsen, page 17.

(120) ibid., pages 9-15.

(121) Andersen and Olsen, op. cit., pages 27-28.

Since more courses are offered than can be given, the Central Study Board draws up general guidelines for admissions, including local school endorsement of applications. The Konsistorium sets up minimum course size and national priorities for choosing between full courses. The different study boards arrange students and classes following these guidelines. The results are known well before classes start, so local schools can plan accordingly. Since there are always more students and courses than possible, applications thus are a "vote" for certain courses and a guide for the future(122).

Centrally run INSET for other levels usually have participatory planning mechanisms, but not as elaborate ones. For instance, INSET for Gymnasium teachers (grades 10-12) is planned by union-ministry committees, based on government guidelines(123). Only local study days seem to differ radically, being planned entirely by each school and its staff through independent "county centrals"(124).

In addition to feedback built into the planning process, feedback discussions between a course's teachers and trainer are common at DLH. Nevertheless, study boards are asking for more systematic evaluation, especially for experimental courses. Systematic evaluation is most often done in questionnaires. The case study stresses the methodological and political limits of systematic evaluation(125).

---

(122) ibid., pages 31-35.

(123) ibid., pages 9-19.

(124) ibid., page 9.

(125) ibid., pages 41-43, 48. See the OECD review of national INSET evaluation studies for a further development of the latter theme.

2.5 Sweden

TABLE 18

Cost of Two Medium Length Courses in Sweden

(in millions of Swedish crowns)

18a. Average cost of a summer course

Type of Cost	Cost	%
1. Planning and evaluation	0.01	17
2. Cost of trainers and material		
3. Travelling expenses	0.03	50
4. Boarding expenses	0.02	33
Total	0.06	100

Note: No estimate of the cost of teacher time given.

18b. Cost of the Team Training Course

Type of Cost	Cost	%
1. Central and regional planning	0.3	3
2. Follow-up and evaluation	0.4	4
3. Cost of trainers and material	0.9	10
4. Travelling expenses	1.1	11
5. Boarding expenses	3.5	34
6. Substitute teachers	3.9	38
Total	10.1	100

Source: S.E. Henricson, "The Swedish Example" in *In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications* - The Danish and Swedish Examples, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1980.

For national INSET costs, see Tables A and B in text.

TABLE 19

Cost of School Management Training Course, 1978-79, Sweden

(in millions of Swedish crowns)

	Types of Cost	Cost	%
1.	Central planning	0.5	2
2.	Evaluation	0.4	2
3.	Regional planning, cost of trainers and material	3.2	14
4.	Travelling expenses	2.7	12
5.	Boarding expenses	2.1	9
6.	Replacements	14.3	61
	Total	23.4	100

Source: *op. cit.*, Table 18.

Patterns of INSET Finance in Sweden

For the centralised Swedish system, the predominance of national funding is obvious in Table A in the text. (The central government also funds the County Boards and the INSET departments mentioned in this table.) Yet local spending is important in two ways. First, the table shows that the largest part of national funding is state grants to local school boards. The biggest share of this money goes to local study days, which local authorities have great freedom in deciding how to use the money. Second, it is difficult to estime direct municipal expenditures on INSET, since they are so decentralised. The figures of 15 million given in Note 2 to the table refers apparently to municipal expenditures on study days only(126). Other local on-going development work is not included(127).

Patterns of Organisation and Planning in Sweden

In Sweden, the Minister of Education has stated that, in substance, the goals and priorities of INSET are to be chosen by the central government, while the means of implementation and plans for staff development can be handled by the parties involved(128). This statement hints at a trend toward decentralisation in the centralised Swedish system.

Nationally, the INSET division of the National Board of Education elaborates general policy and does overall planning. Aside from administering certain national programmes, in conjunction with interested parties, it delegates most detailed programme planning to the six INSET departments and the twenty-four County Boards of Education. The INSET departments, draw up three year "sector plans", working in collaboration with County Boards and municipalities and consulting with representatives of educational personnel, as required by law. They are no longer part of teacher training institutions, but retain special areas of competence. They also run nationwide and individually tailored summer courses and produce some materials(129).

The County Boards, the Swedish regional level, have more of an execution, linking, and consulting function. Chiefly through their INSET consultants, they help local teachers, schools, and even parents and students, with both local concerns and the implementation of national projects, including the increasing local role in development and evaluation(130).

The local school boards run the five yearly study days, help plan national local team training projects, and run the sabbatical year system. They often call on INSET committees with teacher representatives, County Board consultants, and sometimes even their own consultants to help in planning (131).

---

(126) Henricson, op. cit., page 19.

(127) ibid., page 23.

(128) ibid., page 6.

(129) ibid., pages 11-15.

(130) ibid., pages 7-10.

(131) ibid., pages 6-7, 37.

Recent national commissions have recommended that local authorities be given more freedom to plan, carry on, and assess INSET activities and more money to do so, and that central government agencies should act more as agents to offer services to local authorities(132).

In the area of evaluation, participant feedback has been given emphasis in local study days, but also in national study projects where groups such as unions have an advisory role. Systematic evaluation has been given emphasis as well, due to national grants for evaluation as a part of research and development made to the University of Linköping(133).

2.6. France

For cost of two summer institutes, see Table F in text.

Patterns of Organisation and Planning in France

Since no complete cost and resource case study exists, the following few observations are based on the previous OECD case study. First, for the reasons mentioned in the introductory section on national contexts, most official INSET has been at the primary school level. Second, although initial centralisation is great, there has been an effort to decentralise some aspects of INSET, for instance, to the département level in INSET for primary school reform(134) or to the level of the académies (educational regions) in connection with the IREMs (regional mathematics institutes) run in liaison with universities.

Yet the account of this primary school reform, which strongly praises decentralisation and participatory planning, itself underlines one of the basic problems in the French system, the tendency to divide actors into two groups; teachers and representatives of the central government or the "administration"(135). In fact, the various resources available for INSET, such as teacher training colleges, universities, and research and pedagogical documentation centres, depend on the central Ministry, while teachers themselves are grouped in more or less anti-government unions. This situation can become too much of a stalemate, so that in secondary education only voluntary INSET survives, such as that costed in Table F in the text.

---

(132) ibid., pages 43-46.

(133) ibid., page 27.

(134) Belbenoît, op. cit., pages 27 and ff.

(135) ibid., page 31.

SOURCES USED AND QUOTED

Andersen, Henning, and Olsen, Tom Ploug, The Danish Example in *In-Service Educational Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications* - III The Danish and Swedish Examples, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1979.

Argyris, Chris, *Intervention Theory and Method*, A Behavioural Science View, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, United States, 1970.

Belbenoit, Georges, *In-Service Education and Training of Teachers*, France, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1976

Blake, Robert R. and Mouton, Jane Srygley, *Consultation*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., United States, 1976.

Blumberg, Arthur, "A Complex Problem, an Overly Simple Diagnosis", in *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, Volume 13, Number 2, Arlington, Virginia, United States, 1977.

Bolam, Ray, *Innovation in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers*, Practice and Theory, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

Bolam, Ray, *Innovation in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers, United Kingdom*, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1976.

Borich, Gary D. *In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Alternative Approaches to Evaluation of INSET Programmes*. III Examples from the United States, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

Bradley, H.W., *In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications* - II The British Example, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

Cameron, Peter, The Australian Example in *In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications* - I Australian and United States Examples, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

Department of Education and Science, Induction and In-Service Training of Teachers: 1978 Survey in *Statistical Bulletin*, Issue 8/78, December, 1978, London.

Döbrich, Peter; Kodron, Christoph; and Lynch, James; In-Service Education and Training of Teachers: Towards New Policies. *The Utilisation of New Materials - Synthesis Report*, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1980.

Fallon, Barry, and Fallon, Felicity, Teacher Centres in Australia, in *In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Towards School-Focused Training* - V Teacher Centres in Australia and United Kingdom, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

Firestone, William A., "Participation and Influence in the Planning of Educational Change" in The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, Volume 13, Number 2, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioural Science, Arlington, Virginia, United States, 1977.

Fox, F. Thomas, Jr., In-Service Education and Training of Teachers: Towards New Policies. Reflecting upon Evaluation - Synthesis Report, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1980.

Griggs, Audrey, and Gregory, Joan, Teacher Centres in the United Kingdom, in In-Service Education and Training of of Teachers - Towards School-Focused Training - V Teacher Centres in Australia and United Kingdom, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

Henricson, Sven-Eric: The Swedish Example in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications - III The Danish and Swedish Examples, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1980.

Henriques, Sarella, and Terrier, R., La Formation continue des enseignants en France, Coûts monétaires et coûts économiques, Equipe Politique de l'Education, Université de Paris VIII, Vincennes, France (n.d., unpublished manuscript).

Howey, Kenneth R., "Current Perspectives and Evolving Trends in In-Service Education in the United States" in Innovation in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers, United States, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1976.

Howey, Kenneth R., International Workshop on Strategies for School-Focused In-Service Education and Training (INSET), West Palm Beach, Florida, United States, 6th-9th November, 1977, General Report and Conclusions, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

Lévy-Garboua, Louis; Newman, Susan; Noda, Tsutomu; Peacock, Alan; Watanabe, Tsunehiko; and Woodhall, Maureen, Educational Expenditure in France, Japan and the United Kingdom/Les dépenses d'enseignement en France, au Japon et au Royaume-Uni, OECD, Paris, 1977.

Lawrence, Paul, R., and Lorsch, Jay W. Developing Organisations, Diagnosis and Action, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., United States, 1969.

Marklund, Sixten, and Eklund, Harald, Innovation in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers, Sweden, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1976.

McCabe, Colin, "In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Alternative Approaches to Evaluation of INSET Programmes" - II Examples from the United Kingdom, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

Mill, Cyril R., and Porter, Lawrence, C., "*A Hierarchy of Needs*", *in Reading Book for Laboratories in Human Relations Training*, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioural Science associated with the National Education Association, 1972, Edition, Washington, D.C., United States.

Moore, W.L., An LEA Case-Study - Liverpool in *In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications* - II The British Examples, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

Mulford, W.R., In-Service Education and Training of Teachers: Towards New Policies. *The Role and Training of Teacher Trainers - Synthesis Report*, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1980.

OECD, CERI, *Educational Financing and Policy Goals for Primary Schools*, General Report, Paris, 1979.

OECD, CERI, *The International Transfer of Microteaching Programmes for Teacher Education*, Paris, 1975.

OECD, CERI, Secretariat Note for the Salerno Conference, *La Coordination des Institutions responsables de la formation en cours de service des Enseignants*, Paris, 1978.

Parr, B., *The Role of English Universities in the In-Service Training of Teachers*, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1978.

Rubin, Louis, *Innovation in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers, United States*, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1976.

Skilbeck, Malcolm, and Evans, Glen, with the assistance of Harvey, Jim, *Innovation in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers, Australia*, OECD/CERI, Paris, 1976.

Thelin, B., "The Training and Recruitment of Teacher Trainers in Sweden", in *The Teacher and Educational Change: A New New Role*, Vol. I, General Report, OECD, Paris, 1974.

Thurber, John C., "The United States Example in *In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Costs and Financing Implications - I The Australian and United States examples*. OECD/CERI, Paris, 1979.

Vaisey, John, Hewton, Eric, and Norris, Keith, *The Cost of New Educational Technologies*, Fundaçao Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisbon, 1971.